DATE DUE			
NOV 20 '9[illegible]			

BS465.G32
Gaussen, Lois, 1790-1863.
The canon of the Holy
Scriptures examined in ...

IRA J. TAYLOR LIBRARY
THE ILIFF SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
2233 SO. UNIVERSITY BLVD.
DENVER, COLORADO 80210

ILIFF SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
Gaussen, Louis, 1790-1863.
The canon of the Holy Scriptures : exami
BS465.G32
3 3528 00077 4118

CE
G23

THE

CANON OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES

EXAMINED IN THE LIGHT OF HISTORY.

By Prof. L. GAUSSEN,

OF GENEVA, SWITZERLAND,

AUTHOR OF "THEOPNEUSTY," "BIRTH-DAY OF CREATION," ETC., ETC.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH, AND ABRIDGED

By EDWARD N. KIRK, D. D.

463

"Sicuti Deus solus de se idoneus est testis in suo sermone, ita etiam non ante fidem reperiet sermo in hominum cordibus quam interiore spiritus testimonio obsignetur." — Calvin's Instit. 1, 7, 4.

PUBLISHED BY THE

AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY,

28 Cornhill, Boston.

#5414

IRA J. TAYLOR LIBRARY

THE ILIFF SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1862, by the
American Tract Society,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the District of Massachusetts.

RIVERSIDE, CAMBRIDGE:
STEREOTYPED AND PRINTED BY
HENRY O. HOUGHTON.

220.1
923

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

THE question examined in this work is, *What books or documents have a right to be placed in the Sacred Scriptures?* In other words, *What constitutes our Bible?* It was intended by the learned author as a sequel to the "Theopneusty," published more than twenty years since. In the original, the work consists of two volumes, octavo; but, for the purpose of bringing it within a more moderate price, and thus gaining for it a wider circulation among all classes of readers, we have preferred to make some abridgment of it and condense the two volumes into one.

The argument in support of the claims of our Scriptures is presented by the author in a twofold form, called by him, *The Method of Science*, and *The Method of Faith*. The former of these is the one most commonly employed in the works which discuss this subject, showing the authenticity of the several books of our Scriptures, and their right — and theirs only — to a place in the Sacred Canon. The other, which is addressed to those who already receive them as divine, appeals to God's guardian care of his Word, since the formation of the Canon, and the power of his grace working through it upon the hearts of men, as his own recognition of its genuineness and confirmation of its claims upon our faith.

We have judged it best, for the reasons above stated, to give in the present volume the former part only.

It should be remembered, however, that important as the historical evidence on this subject is, it is nevertheless not that upon which the vast majority of believers accept the sacred volume as the Word of God. The latter rests on what is termed the Internal Evidence, or the self-witnessing of the Scriptures. It is the response which they compel from the soul of the reader himself to their truths and precepts. They are *felt* to be divine, — a vital force in him who receives them, "quick and powerful, sharper than a two-edged sword, piercing to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart."

Our eloquent author, in the preface to his second volume, exhibits the value of this internal evidence with great force and beauty, showing that even science itself will fail of properly moving the heart, if there be not added to it this self-witnessing of the Word under the teachings of the Holy Spirit. Our space will permit us to cite but a few paragraphs.

"Our faith requires a support altogether more sure than that based on mere historical evidence. This is attested by the experience of pious men in every age, and earnestly expressed in the most accredited of our confessions of faith. They say, 'We know these books to be canonical, and the very sure rule of our faith, not so much by the common agreement of the Church, as by the testimony of the Holy Spirit.' (Conf. des Eglises Franç., Art. IV.)

"In speaking thus, they did not pretend that this testimony to the Scriptures, given by the Holy Spirit in the heart of

every Christian truly converted by them, would apply directly and equally to every book, chapter, and sentence in them. They meant merely, that for every Christian truly converted, the Bible is seen by the soul to be a miraculous book, a living and efficacious word, penetrating even to the dividing asunder of the soul and the spirit, and revealing to man the very secrets of his own heart; softening, persuading, subduing him with incomparable power. Certainly, never book spake like this book! It 'hath told me all that ever I did.' 'Whence knowest thou me, Lord? Surely, thou art the Son of God, thou art the king of Israel!' From that time the soul can not be mistaken. For it, this book, in whole or in part, is certainly from above. The seals of God Almighty are upon it. Now this 'witness of the Spirit,' of which our fathers spake, which has been more or less recognized by every Christian when he has read his Bible with a living heart, — this testimony can at first be heard by him nowhere but in a page of the Scriptures; and that page has sufficed to shed an incomparable glory over the whole book. And as to the divine authenticity of each of its parts, the Christian reader has legitimate reasons for remaining convinced that the inspiration of those passages in which the Holy Spirit does speak to him, guarantees the remainder, and that he can, moreover, rest in this matter upon the common agreement of the churches and on the faithfulness of God; because a principle of his faith authorizes him to recognize, in this common agreement, a work of divine wisdom. He will then consider the whole book as inspired, long before each of its parts may have been able by itself to prove its divine origin to him. Is it not thus that the naturalist proceeds, when he examines with the solar microscope, in a

living fish, a spot of the size of a pin's point, and there contemplates fourteen streams of blood flowing constantly night and day in two opposite directions, and accomplishing with astonishing beauty the double prodigy of circulation; is it not thus, we say, that it suffices him to have had this spectacle under his eyes, to conclude from it very legitimately that this powerful mystery of the blood and the life is equally accomplished in the whole body?"

While the Scriptures thus address themselves to our faith by their self-evidencing power, we are no less assured of their divine character, as preserved by God's unceasing care, uncorrupted and complete, from age to age. This, as we have already intimated, is forcibly presented in our author's argument in the second form, a summary of which is thus given in his own glowing and eloquent language: — "Faith contemplates that continued and manifestly divine action which, for twenty-three centuries, has employed the almost ever-rebellious people of the Jews to preserve the Canon of the Old Testament free from all mixture. He who has kept it twenty-three hundred years, faith says, can not fail to keep to the end, by Christian people, the Canon of the New Testament. He of whom it is said that, after his ascension to heaven, he was still with his disciples, aiding them and confirming their testimony by signs and wonders (Mark xvi. 20), is not dead! No, it is he who lives; — and has promised (Matt. xxviii. 20) to be with them to the end of the world; that is, not with their persons, but with their testimony, and especially their books. He has not failed to keep his promise, in defending his Church against the gates of hell. He will not permit these gates, then, to prevail against the sacred books, which gave it birth and preserve its

life. Faith says to herself, How shall the elect be saved, if they do not believe? How shall they believe, if the truth be not preached? How shall the truth be preached, if the books which contain it are not given? How shall they be given, if they are not preserved? God, then, in promising that his Church shall never perish, promises, also, that his Word shall never fail. Heaven and earth shall sooner perish!

"Such are the thoughts, and such the confidence of faith, concerning the Canon."

The reader should be notified in advance, that several of the technical terms employed by the author are considered too serviceable to be relinquished, and that will need no other explanation than this: Theopneusty means Inspiration; Canonicity, the right to a place in the Bible; Apostolicity, the fact that an apostle wrote the book; Paulinity, the fact that Paul wrote it; Anagnosis, the public reading of the Scriptures; Homologomens, uncontested books; Antilegomens, contested books.

PREFACE.

"God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets,

"Hath in these last days spoken unto us by *his* Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds;

"Who, being the brightness of *his* glory and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high." — Heb. i. 1–3.

If I venture to publish a book on this subject, it is because I have acquired the threefold persuasion of its present importance, its adaptedness to the understanding of every class of readers, and the abundance of evidence to establish their convictions.

It is obscure only in the distance; and if some regard it as beset with difficulties and uncertainty, it is because they have not studied it aright. Before my own closer examination of it, I was not aware how full of light it is. I have, therefore, believed it my duty, in view of the numerous attacks recently made upon it, to discuss it at length. My reference at first was to the wants of the students in our Theological Seminary. Afterward, I concluded to bring the whole subject within the comprehension of all the members of our churches.

To this end, I have endeavored, in constructing this work, to make my meaning obvious to every serious reader, and I have desired that all the unlearned who may have had their faith disturbed by these attacks of modern skepticism, might find it confirmed by reading these pages.

The proper treatment of such a subject requires a frequent introduction of the writings of the Greek and Latin Fathers, which I have translated, and at the same time furnished what information concerning them I deemed necessary to an understanding of my argument.

This work I intend as a sequel to the volume on the Inspiration of the Scriptures. That, indeed, remained incomplete until accompanied by a Treatise on the Canon; because, after having proved that the Scriptures are inspired, the most convinced reader might still object that he needed to have it proved that Daniel, Esther, the Canticles, or any other particular book of the Old Testament, was a portion of this inspired book; that the epistle of Jude, that of James, the second of Peter, the second and third of John, or any other book included in our New Testament, were legitimately there, and that the Apocryphal books were justly excluded from it.

So long as these inquiries are not definitely resolved, and we have only vague and unsatisfactory answers to them, the privilege of having *an inspired Bible*, is deprived of much of its value; we lack confidence in using it, a discouraging cloud of uncertainty floats between our heavens and the earth; and, while holding in our hands what we call the Scriptures, we yet walk with an infirm step.

It is the object of this work, with God's help, to show the CANONICITY of the twenty-two books of the Old Testament, and the twenty-seven books of the New Testament; that is, their exclusive right to hold a place in the sacred collection of the divine oracles.

The Church (Eph. ii. 20) is "founded upon the apostles and prophets,"[1] who preached to it the gospel, "Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone, in whom all the building fitly framed together, groweth unto a holy temple." It is, then, on the foundation of Jesus Christ and his apostles, or messengers, that the Church, by a constant use

[1] Not *the* prophets, but prophets, or inspired men.

of the Holy Scriptures of both Testaments, has found, from the beginning, and still finds, from age to age and from day to day, her life, her fullness, her power, and her beauty.

Having shown, in a previous work, the divine inspiration of all these books, I shall now attempt to prove the integrity and authenticity, that is, the divine certainty, of both volumes.

And as the proofs which show the canonicity of the books of the New Testament equally establish that of the Old, I shall commence with the former.

CONTENTS.

BOOK FIRST.

Page
CANONICITY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT 17

CHAPTER I.

GENERAL HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON... 17

Section
I. DEFINITION 17
II. THE NOTION OF A CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT TRACED TO THE DAYS OF THE APOSTLES 18
III. THE CHURCH HAS, FROM THE BEGINNING, CONSIDERED THE COLLECTION OF THE SCRIPTURES AS A HARMONIOUS AND COMPLETE WHOLE 23
IV. FIRST FORMATION OF THE CANON 24
V. ORAL PREACHING MUST PRECEDE IT 28
VI. HISTORICAL DIVISION OF THE CANON INTO THREE DISTINCT PARTS, FIRST, SECOND, AND SECOND-FIRST 29
VII. THIS THREEFOLD DIVISION REQUIRED BY THE MOST AUTHENTIC MONUMENTS 30
Three Ante-Nicene Catalogues 31
Catalogue of the Peshito 32
Origen's Catalogue 36
Eusebius's Catalogue 42
VIII. OF THE COUNCIL OF NICE AND ITS RESULTS 52
The Council made no Decree on the Canon 53
All Differences in Regard to the Contested Books ceased after this Council 56
IX. THE ELEVEN AUTHENTIC CATALOGUES OF THE FOURTH CENTURY 57
X. THE NINE CATALOGUES OF THE FOURTH CENTURY GIVEN BY THE FATHERS 58

Section		Page
	Three of them omit only the Apocalypse	58
	Cyril	58
	Gregory Nazianzen	60
	Philastrius	63
	All the Six other Catalogues of the Fourth Century conformed to that of our Churches	64
	Athanasius	64
	Anonymous	67
	Epiphanius	68
	Jerome	70
	Rufinus	73
	Augustine	75
XI.	Other Catalogues pretending to be of the Fourth Century, and conformed to our Canon, are Apocryphal or Forged	76
	The Catalogue of Innocent I.	77
	The Catalogue of Damasus	79
	The Catalogue of Amphilochius	80
XII.	The Two Catalogues of the Fourth Century given by Councils	81
	Character of their Testimony	81
	The Council of Laodicea	83
	The Council of Carthage	90
XIII.	Recapitulation of the Testimonies of the Fourth Century	92
XIV.	Common Prejudices which the First Review of these Facts should dissipate	93
XV.	Conclusion from all these Testimonies	100

CHAPTER II.

OF THE FIRST CANON		102
I.	The Perfect and Constant Unanimity of the Churches	102
II.	The New Testament in its Twenty-two Homologomenous Books incomparably Superior to all the Books of Antiquity, in the Evidence of its Authenticity	106

Section Page
III. Three Causes which secured this Unanimity 115
The Long Career of the Apostles 115
The Immense Number of the Churches at the Time of the Apostles' Death 123
The Anagnosis 131
IV. The Various Monuments of the Canon 145
Four Kinds of Monuments 145
The Field of Investigation 146
The Actors and Witnesses 148
V. Testimony of the Fathers of the Second Half of the Second Century 156
The United Testimonies of Irenæus, Clement, and Tertullian 156
Seven Characteristics of their Testimony 160
Tertullian 163
Clement of Alexandria 166
Irenæus 172
Other Cotemporary Fathers 186
Conclusion from all these Testimonies 188
VI. The Fragment called Muratori's 194
VII. Testimony of the Fathers of the First Half of the Second Century 200
Justin Martyr 200
Objections to his Testimony 215
Other Historical Monuments 217
VIII. Testimony of the Infidel Pagans in the Second Century 220
Their Writings 220
Testimony of Celsus 221
Force of this Testimony 225
IX. Testimony of the Heretics in the First Half of the Second Century 227
The Character of this Testimony 227
Marcion 231
Tatian 239
Valentinus and the Valentinians 241
Heracleon and Ptolemy 244
Basilides and his Son Isidore 246
X. Testimony of the Apostolical Fathers 248

Section Page

Their Limited Number and Value 248
Epistle to Diognetus 254
The Encyclical Epistle of the Church of Smyrna ... 256
The Epistle of Polycarp 258
Ignatius, his Martyrdom and Letters 263
Epistle of Clemens Romanus to the Corinthians 267
Conclusion from the Testimony of the Apostolical Fathers 288
XI. The Last Books of the New Testament attest the Existence of a Canon already begun 289

CHAPTER III.

OF THE SECOND-FIRST CANON 293

I. The Apocalypse 294
Its First Reception 294
Its Date 297
The Apocalypse in the First Century 301
Witnesses of the First Half of the Second Century .. 302
Witnesses of the Second Half of the Same Century . 306
Witnesses of the First Half of the Third Century ... 308
Witnesses of the Second Half of the Third Century . 314
Witnesses of the Fourth Century 315
Witnesses of the Fifth Century 319
II. The Epistle to the Hebrews 320
Its Character and History 320
Testimony of the East in the Fourth Century 322
Testimony of the East in the Third Century 324
Testimony of the East in the Second Century 326
Testimony of the East in the First Century 328
Western Testimonies 330
Review of these Testimonies 333
Paulinity of this Epistle 335
Objections 342

CHAPTER IV.

OF THE SECOND CANON 347

I. General Facts 347

Section Page
II. The Epistle of James 350
Its Importance 350
Its Immediate Admission among those to whom it was first addressed 352
Its Date 353
Cause of the Hesitation of some Churches 354
Witnesses 355
Its Excellence 358
Which James was the Author 359
III. The Second Epistle of Peter 365
The Study it claims 365
The Letter claims to be Peter's 366
The Majestic Character of the Epistle 367
Why its Acceptance was delayed 370
Its Style 370
Its History 372
The Definitive Agreement of all the Christian Churches was late 373
The Successive Acceptance was gradual 374
The Assent was, in one Part of the Church, immediate 380
IV. The Two Shorter Epistles of John 384
V. The Epistle of Jude 387
The Author of this Epistle 387
Its Date 388
Objections against this Epistle 391
Alleged Quotations from Apocryphal Books 392
Testimonies of the Second Century 403
Testimonies of the Third Century 405
Testimonies of the Fourth Century 406
VI. General Considerations on the Antilegomens 407

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF THE CANON SINCE THE FOURTH CENTURY 422

The Unanimity of all the Churches 422
The Exceptional Freedom accompanying the Formation and Maintenance of the Canon 426

Page
The Independence of the Church towards the Schools 429
Genuineness of the Text 434
The Books alleged to be lost 437

BOOK SECOND.

CANONICITY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT..... 442

CHAPTER I.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE JEWS..... 442

CHAPTER II.

THE TESTIMONY OF JESUS CHRIST..... 445

CHAPTER III.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE APOSTLES..... 448

CHAPTER IV.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS FROM THE FOREGOING FACTS 449

CHAPTER V.

OF THE APOCRYPHAL BOOKS..... 452

History of the Apocrypha before the Council of Trent 452
Reasons against the Decree of Trent 455
Unanimous Testimony of the Churches against the Decree of Trent 457

CHAPTER VI.

CONCLUSION..... 460

BOOK FIRST.

CANONICITY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

CHAPTER FIRST.

GENERAL HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON.

SECTION I.

DEFINITION.

THE term Canon, as employed in this sense, is traced back to a remote antiquity. In Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, the words קָנֶה, *κάννη*, *κάννα*, *κανών*, *canna*, having the same origin, signify literally a *reed*, a *straight rod*, a *cane*, a *measure*, a *rule;* and more especially, *κανών*, in a metaphorical sense, signifies *every straight and perfect rule.* In the proper sense of this word, the terms *cane* and *cannon*, in the Middle Ages, were applied to tubes intended to *regulate*, or render right or straight, the direction of projectiles thrown by the explosion of powder.[1] Paul thus says to the Galatians, (Gal. vi. 16,) "As many as walk according to *this rule*, (*κανών*,) peace be on them." And to the Philippians, (Phil. iii. 16,) "Let us walk by the same rule," (*κανών*.)

Even in the times of the apostles, the old grammarians

[1] The application of this word to an instrument of war commenced in Italy. It was there called *cannone*, or *grande canna.*

of Alexandria made use of the same term to designate model authors, making *rules* in literature; so that the ecclesiastical writers early employed it to mean sometimes *Christian doctrine*, the rule of our life; sometimes, the *divine book*, the only rule of our faith; sometimes, in fine, the *catalogue* of the sacred books composing this rule. This became at length its almost exclusive religious meaning.[1]

SECTION II.

THE NOTION OF A CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT TRACED TO THE DAYS OF THE APOSTLES.

Before even consulting the ecclesiastical historians on this subject, we may already comprehend, from the nature of things, that the idea of a divine collection of the writings of the New Testament, must have early sprung up in all the communities of those who believed in Christ. Is it not evident that it must have originated as soon as these churches saw the men, "apostles and prophets,"[2] who announced to them the gospel with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven,[3] beginning to write to them apostolical letters, or transmit to them the history of the Saviour's life and teachings?

In fact, they were entirely prepared for it by having in their hands the Old Testament. This collection, already

[1] It should, however, be remarked, to avoid all mistake in examining the writings of the Fathers, that while they had a distinct and definite catalogue of books, which they regarded as inspired, and as distinguished from the apocryphal or uninspired, but which were allowed to be read in churches, yet they did not at first agree in their use of the term *canon*. From a varied application of it to lists of clergymen, and even of church furniture, it came in the fourth century to be applied, as now, to the catalogue of Scriptures. But then it will be found that some time elapsed before Jerome's use of the term *canonical*, as being coextensive with *inspired*, was generally adopted.—*Tr.*

[2] Eph. ii. 20. [3] 1 Pet. i. 12.

formed for so many ages, and of the divinity of which there was never but one opinion among the Jews, as Josephus informs us;[1] this collection, venerated by the people of God in every age, venerated by the Apostles, who called it *the oracles of God;*[2] venerated by the Son of God himself, who called it *the Law*, *your Law*, *the Scripture*, *the Scriptures;* venerated by the Christian churches, who read it in all their assemblies; this collection, we say, must necessarily have led all their company to the notion of an analogous collection of the sacred books of the New Testament.

Was not the idea of a canon of the scriptures the characteristic trait of the people of God for fifteen hundred years? Had it not always appeared to them from the beginning of their national existence, the very reason of their existence, and the indispensable means of its continuance? Yet, at the same time, this notion born in the desert with the Israelitish church, and always maintained by that church, had never been that of a code completed by one hand, or in one generation, or received in its fullness once for all. On the contrary, it was that of a collection commencing with the five books of Moses, and destined to grow from age to age; continued by the addition of new books, during eleven centuries, as God raised up new prophets, and not ceasing to accumulate its treasures to the days of Malachi, when the spirit of prophecy became silent for four centuries. It was then very natural that the church, at the coming of the Messiah, should look for new additions, since the ancient spirit of prophecy had just been restored to her, and since new men of God, "apostles and prophets," more miraculously endowed than the ancients, had just been raised up. We may go farther; it was even impossible that she should not expect it. Was not the epoch of Christ's advent much more important and solemn than that of his annunciation; were

[1] Reply to Apion, Book I. chap. 2.
[2] Rom. iii. 2; Heb. v. 12; 1 Pet. iv. 11.

not the revelations more striking; the objects more divine; the promises richer; the prophets more powerful; the signs more marvelous?

Nor should we forget that the church has already begun in the synagogue and, for the first fifteen years of Christianity, contains no other than Jewish members. All her preachers and her first converts are Jews. At the last voyage Paul made to meet the converts in Jerusalem, the members of that church, mother of all the others, contained already many thousands, (Acts xxi. 20, πόσαι μυριάδες.) In all the cities of the Gentiles the apostles began their labors among the children of Israel. And there they constantly held in their hands the canon of the scriptures, and always repeated the words of Jesus, "Search the Scriptures," (John v. 39.) Always they "expounded and testified the kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus, both out of the law of Moses, and out of the prophets," (Acts xxviii. 23.) "Saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come," (Acts xxvi. 22.) And even although they did not directly quote from the sacred books, when preaching to pagan audiences, yet they were very careful to do it as soon as these had been brought to believe. We may select, as an instance, the salutation of Paul in closing his epistle to the Romans: "Now to him that is of power to establish you according to my gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery which is now made manifest by the SCRIPTURES of the PROPHETS, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations, for the obedience of faith. To God only wise, be glory through Jesus Christ, for ever. Amen."

So then if, on the one hand, the notion of a canon of the scriptures was, as it were, incarnated in the people of God,—if it was with them inseparable from the notion of the church; on the other hand, the thought of incorporating the not less sacred books of the New Testament with those of the Old,

as they were written successively, was with them equally inseparable from their notion of the scriptures.

The history of primitive Christianity strongly confirms this view of the notion of the sacred canon then prevalent in the church. So far from being introduced at a later period, as has been asserted by some, we find it constantly, from the beginning, both in the church and in its enemies.

The evidence of this we shall produce at length, contenting ourselves here with a few quotations. Peter, in closing his career, in his Second Epistle, speaking of "all the epistles of Paul," calls them "the scriptures," comparing or classing them with "the other scriptures."[1]

From the beginning, the writings of the apostles were successively gathered into one collection, which was respected by the primitive Christians equally with the Old Testament, which they read in their religious meetings, and which, after Peter's example, they called *the Scriptures*; or after the example of the Fathers *the Book*, (τὰ Βιβλία,) *the New Testament*,[2] *the Divine Instrument*,[3] *the Sacred Digest*,[4] *the Divine Oracles*; or again, *the Evangelists and the Apostles*;[5] after the example of Jesus Christ, who had called the Old Testament "*the Law and the Prophets*." They then early adopted the custom of calling it *the Canon*, or *the Rule*,

[1] 2 Pet. iii. 16. This testimony, whatever objections any may have to the canonicity of this Epistle, shows indisputably the antiquity of the usage which ranks the books of the New Testament with the Scriptures; for we shall hereafter establish the *antiquity* of this Epistle, even independently of its *canonicity*.

[2] See Lardner, vol. viii. p. 197. See, also, vol. ii. p. 529. Paul having given the name of *Old Testament* to the Book of Moses and the Prophets, it was altogether natural that they should give to the book of the Evangelists and Apostles the name of New Testament, and that they should call it *intestamented*, or ἐνδιαθήκους, (Euseb. H. E. vi. 25,) the books admitted into the canon.

[3] Tertullian adv. Marcion, Lib. v. cap. 13.

[4] Ibid. Lib. iv. cap. 13.

[5] Clement of Alexandria, Strom. vii. pp. 706, 757. Ignatius, Ep. to the Philad. chap. v. Epis. to Diognet, chap. xi. Justin Martyr, Great Apol. chap. 67. Tertullian, de Graec. Script. chap. 36. Apol. chap. 39. Hippolitus the Martyr, on Antichrist, chap. 58.

and whatever constituted a portion of this infallible code, *Canonical Books.*

Irenæus, born in Greece A. D. 120 or 140, and martyred in A. D. 202, speaking of the Scriptures as divine, calls them *the Rule*, or *the Canon* of Truth (κανόνα τῆς ἀληθείας).[1] *Tertullian*, in the same century, opposing Valentinus to Marcion, both deep in the Gnostic heresy, toward A. D. 138, says of the former, that he at least appears to make use of a *Complete Instrument*, meaning the collection of the books of the New Testament then accepted by the church.[2] *Clement of Alexandria*, in the same century, speaking of a quotation taken from an apocryphal book, is indignant that any one should follow anything but "the true evangelical canon;" and *Origen*, born A. D. 183, careful, as Eusebius [3] remarks, to follow the *ecclesiastical canon*, τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν φυλάττων κανόνα, "declares that he knows only the four Gospels, which alone, he adds, are admitted without contradiction in the universal church spread abroad under the whole heavens." The same Origen, when giving us his catalogue of canonical Scriptures, calls them αἱ ἐνδιαθήκαι γραφαί, the *intestamented* Scriptures,[4] that is, the books inserted in the New Testament. *Athanasius*, in his Festal Epistle,[5] speaks of three kinds of books: the *canonical*, (which are those of our present Protestant Bible); the *ecclesiastical*, which were permitted to be read in the Christian meetings; and the *apocryphal.* And when, at a later period, the Council of Laodicea, A. D. 364, decreed that no other book than "the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments" should be read in the churches, far from originating the distinction between canonical and uncanonical books, this decree was but a sanctioning of the distinction long before adopted by the universal church.

1 Adv. Hæreses, Book iii. chap. 11; Book iv. chaps. 35, 69.

2 Tertullian De Præscript. Hæretic. chaps. 30–38.

3 Ecc. Hist. Book vi. chap. 25.

4 Ibid.

5 Chap. xxxix. vol. ii. p. 961, Benedict. edit. τὰ κανονιζόμενα καὶ παραδοθέντα πιστευθέντα τε θεῖα εἶναι Βιβλία.

Jerome also frequently speaks of the canon of Scripture. He says, for instance, "Ecclesiasticus, Judith, Tobit, the Pastor, . . . are not in the canon. The church permits the books of Judith, Tobit, and the Maccabees to be read, but she does not receive them as a part of the *canonical* Scriptures. The books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus may be read for the edification of the people, but not as authority for establishing doctrine."[1]

Such is the origin of the notion of the canon, and such is its meaning.

SECTION III.

THE CHURCH HAS, FROM THE BEGINNING, CONSIDERED THE COLLECTION OF THE SCRIPTURES AS A HARMONIOUS AND COMPLETE WHOLE.

ALTHOUGH the books of the New Testament were given successively to the primitive church, yet she always regarded, from the beginning, the collection, as she received its portions respectively, a complete whole, having God for its author, and destined throughout to reveal Jesus Christ; just as ancient Israel had regarded the collection of books forming the Old Testament, received, in the same manner, in successive portions, as a single harmonious unit, having the same God for its author, and destined, throughout all its parts, to reveal to her the counsel of God for the redemption of his elect.

To give here but one or two examples, taken from the first century of the church or the beginning of the second; let any one read how, in his beautiful "Epistle to Diognetus,"[2] the author, who styles himself one of the disciples of the

1 See, also, Lardner, vol. x. pp. 41, 43, 52.

2 The learned Galland (Bibl. Veterum Patrum, l. c.) believes it to have been written before the year 70. See, also, Hefele (Prolegom, p. 79, Patr. Apost.), who (as Böhl, Opusc. Patrum Sel.,) believed it to be cotemporary with the days of the apostles.

apostles,[1] presents *the Law and the Prophets, the Evangelists and the Apostles*, as acting together to bring into the church grace and joy. He says,[2] "Thus the fear of the LAW is proclaimed, and the grace of the PROPHETS is comprehended and the faith of the GOSPELS is founded, and the instruction of the APOSTLES is preserved, and the grace of the church leaps for joy." Ignatius also, about A. D. 107, in one of his epistles, said to the Philadelphians, (chap. v.) "Your prayer will secure my completeness in God. . . . Giving me refuge in the GOSPEL, as in the flesh of Jesus, and in the APOSTLES, as in the presbytery of the church. And cling also to the PROPHETS, because they have themselves announced the gospel, hoped in Christ, looked for his coming in the unity of Jesus Christ, and found their salvation in him by faith."[3]

The canon of the New Testament being then the collection of the books written at various times, and in different places, during the latter half of the apostolical century, by eight inspired authors, must have been completed gradually; and have become complete toward the end of the first century, or the beginning of the second.

SECTION IV.

FIRST FORMATION OF THE CANON.

DURING the first fifteen years after our Saviour's death, the church was begotten, nourished, and strengthened by the

[1] Chap. xi. See, also, his chap. xii. Ἀποστόλων γενόμενος μαθητής.

[2] Chap. xi. εἶτα φόβος ΝΟΜΟΥ ᾄδεται, καὶ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΩΝ χάρις γινώσκεται, καὶ ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΩΝ πίστις ἱδρύεται, καὶ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ παράδοσις φυλάσσεται, καὶ ἐκκλησίας Χάρις σκιρτᾷ.

[3] Προσφυγὼν τῷ ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΩ ὡς σαρκὶ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ΤΟΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΙΣ ὡς πρεσβυτερίῳ ἐκκλησίας· Καὶ τοὺς ΠΡΟΦΗΤΑΣ, &c. Yet this epistle is one of those which Cureton has left out of his Syriac edition.

merely oral preaching of the truth, and by the Scriptures of the Old Testament, explained either by themselves or by the teachings of the apostles and evangelists; "God bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will." Heb. ii. 4. 2 Pet. i. 21. And when the apostles and evangelists were preaching the Word to the churches "with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven," (1 Pet. i. 12,) they always appealed, as their Master had done, to the already completed canon of the inspired Scriptures of the Old Testament. They required men to study these continually; they declared them "able to make the man of God perfect," "wise unto salvation," "thoroughly furnished unto all good works." 2 Tim. iii. 15, 17.

It was but fifteen years after the ascension of the Saviour, that the ancient canon of "the Oracles of God," closed for four hundred years, was reopened to receive the first Scriptures of the New Testament; I mean the two epistles to the Thessalonians. This I say, because there are the most satisfactory reasons for believing that none of the gospels preceded them. Thus, for two or three years, the canon of the New Testament consisted of only these two epistles, which Paul, assisted by Silas and Timothy, wrote to the young church in Thessalonica, A. D. 48. It is therefore very probable that it was because of their commencing the new canon of the Oracles of God, that the apostle, from the beginning, insisted so strongly upon their divine authority. "I charge you by the Lord" to keep them, study them, read them "unto all the holy brethren." 1 Thess. v. 27. He adjures them solemnly by the invocation of that dreadful name, to cause this first Scripture to be made known to all Christendom. And he addresses this epistle to a church to whom the gospel "came not in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost." 1 Thess. i. 5. And he was careful to remind them that the word which he had brought to them was *the word of God*. He renders thanks that they received

it, "*not as the word of man, but, as it really is, the Word of God.*"

It was, then, during the sixteen or seventeen years between the production of these first two books (A. D. 48,) and the death of Paul, (A. D. 64 or 65.) that almost all the other writings of the New Testament were produced; at least the *twenty books* which compose what we shall presently denominate *the first canon*, that is, the four gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the first thirteen epistles of Paul, the first of Peter, and the first of John. But it was later, and even toward the latter years of the first century, that the seven other books of the New Testament were published, excepting perhaps the epistle of James, which may have been written about A. D. 61; because, according to Josephus, this martyr must have been stoned during the troubles preceding the destruction of Jerusalem; that is, immediately after the death of Festus, the governor, and while they were awaiting the arrival of Albinus in Judea.[1]

Thus the entire canon of the New Testament was begun and completed during this last half of the first century. It was then that the church, already formed, and not ceasing to expand, had already reached the extremities of the known world, through the incomparable labors of Paul, Peter, John, Thomas, and the other apostles, as also of many other laborers, whose names, unknown to us, are written in heaven. It must then be remembered that the primitive church, during its militant and victorious march across this first century of its existence, saw its canon of the New Testament formed in its hands, as a bouquet is formed in the hands of a lady who is passing through a garden, with its owner accompanying her. As she advances, he presents her one flower after another, until the whole collection is made. And as the bouquet already exists and is admired while yet incomplete, and as soon as she has gathered the first flowers, so the New Testament canon was in the hand of the church from the

[1] Antiq. xx. chap. 8.

time when the first inspired books were placed in its hands. Was it not also thus that, under the Old Testament, in the days of David, and a thousand years before the apostles, the Jewish church already had her sacred canon, consisting of six or eight books, calling it THE LAW, divine and perfect law,[1] although two thirds of the Old Testament were yet wanting? "It is a lamp to my feet," she already exclaimed, "it restores my soul; I meditate therein all the day." Was it not so, likewise, five hundred years before David, with the church in the wilderness,[2] in the days of Moses, with her sacred canon consisting of five books, when she exclaimed, "Happy art thou, O Israel! who is like unto thee? for it (the law) is not a vain thing for you, it is your life?"[3]

The church is responsible for the books which God gives her, and not for those he may intrust to a future generation. In every age she has received from him those which she needed; and, in every age, too, she has had reason to say with David, "The law of the Lord is perfect."[4]

How well it is for the confirmation of our faith, that, instead of being given all at once, by the founder of our religion, containing his acts and his revelations, the New Testament was given by him in a succession of twenty-seven writings, and in the course of more than one half century, by eight different authors, separated from each other by great distances and by very dissimilar circumstances; some learned, others unlearned; some in Judea, others in Rome; some within ten or fifteen years of the Master's death, others even fifty-five years after it; some having been strangers to him personally — one, indeed, his most furious persecutor, — and others his most devoted and assiduous friends. It results from this, that the harmony of their accounts of his origin, life, character, and doctrines; their uniform agreement in presenting

[1] Ps. xix. cxix.; John x. 34; xii. 34.
[2] Acts vii. 38.
[3] Deut. xxxiii. 29; xxxii. 47.
[4] Ps. xix. 8.

subjects the most transcendental as well as duties till then unknown; in a word, the marvelous and profound unity of their instructions; — all these appear at once more manifest and more sublime.

Is it surprising that this book, which charms all nations, even the most savage; which every where responds to their wants and adapts itself, from age to age, to every degree of civilization, should every where elevate their characters, produce always effects which no other instruction has ever secured, changing the affections, subduing the wills, giving birth to all the heroisms, and civilizing in a few years the most barbarous nations; as we see it in the very beginning, overthrowing, among the most cultivated people of the world, idolatries whose origin was lost in the night of time, and renewing the face of the earth?

SECTION V.

ORAL PREACHING MUST PRECEDE BY SEVERAL YEARS WRITTEN PREACHING, OR THE GIFT OF THE NEW SCRIPTURES.

It was proper that the apostles should preach with the living voice several years before commencing the formation of the New Testament; for it was necessary before continuing by new inspired writings the Sacred Book, interrupted by an interval of four hundred years, that they should have living churches widely scattered, to whom their treasure might be committed. It was then necessary that a people of God, intelligent and faithful, should have been already collected, both among the Gentiles and the Jews. It was necessary especially for two reasons: first, to settle solidly the conviction that the religion of Jesus Christ, so far from being in opposition to that of Moses and the prophets, on the contrary, is founded on them; then, that wherever and whenever the divine epistles with which the New Testament was to com-

mence, should appear, there should be a people ready to receive, preserve, and transmit them. It was necessary that there should be men truly converted, united in churches, to whom these letters could be addressed, who should successively receive these new Scriptures, and who should become the vouchers for their authenticity, whether by reading them every Sabbath or every Sunday in their holy assemblies (as Justin Martyr, represents [1]); or by preserving the very originals in their oratories, (as Tertullian affirms.[2]) Thus the holy tradition of the written Word was to be transmitted safely from age to age, to all the churches of God.

SECTION VI.

HISTORICAL DIVISION OF THE CANON INTO THREE DISTINCT PARTS.

We shall call THE FIRST CANON (or *first rule*) the collection of the twenty books above enumerated; because, the first distributed during the lifetime of the apostles and by their own direction, they were immediately received by all Christendom, eastern and western, without having, from the beginning, and for eighteen centuries, their divine authority ever called in question by the Christian churches. This *first canon* of the undisputed books forms by itself *eight ninths of the New Testament*, if we count by verses, having 7059 out of 7959.

We shall call the SECOND CANON the collection of the five brief later epistles of James,[3] Peter, Jude, and John, because written a short time before the deaths of these men of God, and distributed after their deaths in a distracted period, their authors could not be appealed to to confirm them; so

1 1st Apol. 67.

2 See Canon, chap. ii. sec. iii.

3 We will explain hereafter in what sense this epistle is called *later* relatively to the churches of the Circumcision.

that, not being written and directed like the first thirteen of Paul to particular persons or churches who were charged to preserve and circulate them, these five short letters were not received immediately by the whole church, though by the majority of the churches, (τοῖς πολλοῖς, τοῖς πλείστοις, says Eusebius);[1] another part of these churches having hesitated a longer or shorter time to receive them as divine, until at length a universal acceptance of them took place after the decision of the first general council. This second canon, measured by the number of its verses is only the *thirty-sixth part of the New Testament*, or 222 to 7959.

Finally we shall call the SECOND-FIRST CANON the collection of two books (Hebrews and Revelation) which could be ranked absolutely in neither of the other classes. They can not be placed in the second, because they were both recognized universally and without dissent during the first two centuries of the church, and because Eusebius places them, for this reason, among the books which he calls *homologomens*, or *undisputed*. Nor could we place them in the first canon, because they were afterwards contested for a time, the one principally in the West, the other in the East. These facts will be more exactly considered hereafter.

SECTION VII.

THIS THREEFOLD DIVISION OF THE CANON REQUIRED BY THE MOST AUTHENTIC MONUMENTS OF THE CHURCH.

If we divide the canon into these three distinct parts, it is not in order to attribute the less certainty of their divine origin to some than to others; for, although their certainty is not the same in a purely historical point of view, we shall hereafter show that our faith in the authority of all is founded

[1] Canon, chap. i. sec. 7.

upon the same solid bases. But we cordially adopt this threefold division of our sacred books, both to conform to the facts of ecclesiastical history, and to proceed with more method in the demonstration of their canonicity.

Three Ante-Nicene Catalogues.

Besides the numerous testimonies drawn from the fathers, to authorize this triple distinction, we have three ancient catalogues of the Scriptures, which, without being entirely identical, equally lead us to adopt it. They are all anterior to the famous council held in Nice. The first belongs to the period of John's death, at the end of the first century; the second belongs to the commencement of the third century; the last to the beginning of the fourth century. The first is furnished us by the ancient Syriac version of the New Testament, called the Peshito.[1] The second is given us twice by Origen; first directly, in a homily on Joshua,[2] and then indirectly in the quotations which Eusebius has made from his Commentaries on Matthew, John, and the Epistle to the Hebrews.[3] The third is furnished by Eusebius himself, in A. D. 324, in the third book of his Ecclesiastical History.

These are the only catalogues anterior to the council of Nice, and worthy of confidence, which have come down to us; for we do not here speak of either the catalogue introduced in the apocryphal book of the *Apostolical Canons*, nor of the anonymous Roman Catalogue discovered in 1738, by Muratori, in the Ambrosian Library of Milan, and therefore bearing his name.[4] It is a fragment greatly mutilated, the date and author of which are absolutely unknown. The beginning and the end are lost; and the Latin is exceedingly

[1] ܦܫܝܛܐ, *i. e. The Simple*, or *literal.*
[2] Hom. 8, Op. xii. p. 410; Latin version of Rufinus.
[3] Euseb. Eccl. Hist. Lib. vi. chap. 25.
[4] Muratori, Antiq. Italicæ, Vol. iii. p. 854.

barbarous and incorrect. This document, in a word, which indeed gives us almost precisely the same canon as the Peshito, is in too disordered a condition to serve for an authority in determining the doubtful historical points of the canon; but, as it may still be very useful in establishing the authenticity of our Scriptures, we shall resume the consideration of it with special care, in our second chapter.[1]

Catalogue of the Peshito.[2]

The Peshito version of the New Testament is the most ancient, the most celebrated, the most respected of all. It was not known in Europe until the mission of Moses of Mardin, deputed in 1552 by the patriarch of the Maronites to Pope Julius III. Michaelis, who, in accordance with many of the most eminent philologists, attributes it to the first century, or, at latest, to the second, declares it to be the best version known to him, whether in regard to its freedom, elegance, or fidelity as a translation. All who have studied it admire the good sense and intelligence of its authors, their independence, and accuracy. And, as to its antiquity, every one will understand that the Aramean people must have had the Scriptures in their own language, at an early day; they were, in fact, the first to receive the gospel; and their churches abounded, not only in Syria, but also on the banks of the Euphrates and Tigris, in Adiabene, Orsoëne, Edessa, Nisibis, and Carræ when their literature had become fully developed.

The Scriptures of the New Testament must, therefore, have been translated very early in the midst of them in the very language spoken by the primitive churches and by Jesus

[1] See Canon, chap. ii. sec. vi.

[2] See Murdock, Translation. New Haven. Adler, N. T. Vers. Syr. Copenh. 1789. Hug. Introd. 62. Wiseman, Horæ Syriacæ, Rome, 1828. Wichelhaus, De N. T. Vers. Syriaca Peshito, Halle, 1850 W. Cureton, Remains of a very ancient Recension of the Four Gospels in Syriac, London, 1858.

Christ.[1] Thus we find toward the first half of the second century, in the history of Eusebius, an interesting trace of the usage already established in those countries, of reading and quoting the Syriac Scriptures of the New Testament. In speaking of the celebrated Hegesippus, who was the earliest ecclesiastical historian, Eusebius, to show that this author was unquestionably a Jewish Christian, remarks that he takes his quotations either from the Hebrew or the Syriac version. Now this Hegesippus, whose works are lost, and who had written, in five books, the History of the Church, under the title of *Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, was, says Eusebius,[2] very near the days of the apostles, for he lived under Adrian, (from A. D. 117 to 138,) and also under Anicet, (from A. D. 157 to 168). It is for this reason Jerome, in his "Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers," places him before Justin Martyr, born A. D. 103, and executed A. D. 167. These facts then give us the evidence of the high antiquity of the Peshito version.

But, more than this, we have additional testimony to its remote origin. Universal opinion has always assigned it that; and even to our day the Syrian Christians regard the Peshito as the original of the New Testament. They believe this, because their language was that of the apostles and primitive Christians of Jerusalem, whose churches, as soon as they were formed, divided themselves into Hellenists and Hebrews, or Arameans (Acts vi. 1); that, also, of the greater part of the churches founded among the Oriental Jews, especially in Babylon and Orsoëne, where the Syriac Old Testament had existed for ages. We know that, according to the testimony of all the Fathers, it was in Aramean that Matthew first wrote his Gospel; but it is more probable that he issued an edition of his book in Greek, and another in Aramean at the same time. It appears, at least, that, from the days of the apostles, wherever either of the three Ara-

[1] Hist. Eccl. Lib. iv. chap. 22.
[2] Ib. Lib. ii. chap. 23.

mean dialects[1] was spoken, translations of the several books of the New Testament were in use.

Edessa, where the Aramean literature had a remarkable prevalence for a long period, and where the Apostle Thaddeus[2] preached the Christian faith with so great success, is often referred to as the place where the Peshito version was made.[3] It had become, from the second century, the site of an important Christian school; it was called "the Holy City," because of its unwavering zeal for the Christian faith; and even Eusebius said, as early as A. D. 324, that from the days of Thaddeus's successful labors unto his time, "the entire city of the Edessans had continued to show themselves attached to the name of Christ." Its antiquity, too, is manifest from its being employed by all the different sects into which the Syrian Christians were divided. The Nestorians, the Jacobites, the Romanists, all equally agree to use it in their respective worships; although there were, as Wiseman declares, as many as twelve different versions of the Old Testament, and three versions or revisions of the New Testament. Yet none of them has ever supplanted the Peshito for liturgical purposes. It must therefore have been in universal use long before the origin of these different sects.

Now this ancient version already contained our canon complete, with the single exception of the Revelation and the four shorter and later Epistles of Jude, Peter, and John. Such, then, at the beginning of the second century, or rather at the end of the first, was the canon of the Syriac churches. We find, this day, the Peshito version in two forms of manuscript: the one in ancient Syriac characters; the other, (of Indian origin,) in Nestorian characters; but all of them contain the same canon.[4]

There are here two important facts to be noticed: —

[1] Michaëlis informs us that they differed from each other only in the pronunciation. Lib. ii. chap. 23.

[2] Hist. Eccl. Lib. ii. chap. 1.

[3] Adler, N. T. Vers. Syr. etc. p. 42.

[4] Adler, N. T. Vers. Syr. p. 3.

1. The absence of any non-canonical book; although they had begun in the East, from the second century, to publish a great many, under false apostolical titles.

2. The order uniformly assigned to the sacred books. It is always that found in the best and oldest Greek manuscripts; first, the four evangelists in their invariable order, Matthew, Mark, Luke, John; then the Acts; then the catholic epistles; and the fourteen epistles of Paul, always in the same order as we now have, from Romans to Hebrews.[1]

It is readily seen why the two smaller epistles of John, written so late and so far from Babylonia, were not yet received there; and, as to the Apocalypse, as we shall hereafter see, it could not yet make a part of the canon, not having appeared at Ephesus, on the coast of the Ægean Sea, until the end of the first century or beginning of the second; that is, after the Peshito, or, at least, but shortly before this version was made in the East. John had not his visions in Patmos until near the close of Domitian's reign, as Irenæus clearly shows;[2] so that his book could not have appeared before the last four years of the first century. And, what clearly proves that the Apocalypse was not in the Peshito, only because it was issued after it, is, that the Syrian churches, so far from rejecting it when it appeared, on the contrary, quoted from it as a divine book. Also Dr. Thiersch, who gives the Peshito a later date than the Apocalypse, is persuaded that the former originally contained the latter. "We have no doubt of it," he says, "from the researches of Hug; otherwise, where did Ephraim obtain his Syriac Apoca-

[1] This refers to the Greek Testament. For, in the Latin translations anterior to Jerome, who restored the texts of the West to the original Greek type, they had inverted the order of the four Gospels, (as may be seen in the ancient MS. entitled that of Beza, or Cambridge.) Jerome, in his preface, exhibits to Pope Damasus how greatly they had corrupted, even in his day, the Latin copies of the Gospel. See Berger de Xivrey, Etudes sur le Texte de N. T. Paris, 1856.

[2] Adv. Hæres. Lib. iii. chap. 30; Euseb. Hist. Lib. iii. chap. 18.

lypse?"[1] It must be remarked, moreover, that, if this version did not yet contain the Apocalypse, it did contain the epistle to the Hebrews and that of James; since these two letters, because late, and almost posthumous, were yet both given before the death of Paul; and also since they were more properly accepted by the Syriac than by the Gentile churches, having been more directly addressed to them.

It may then be concluded, from these facts, that the oldest catalogue of New Testament books which has reached us — this monument, so near the apostles' days as to have been cotemporary with John — this first catalogue authorizes us already to divide, as we have done, in a historical point of view, the scriptural canon into three distinct parts: 1. The twenty books always and universally received by every portion of the church. 2. Two other books not doubted among the Aramean Christians in Palestine, Syria, Adiabene, Mesopotamia, or Orsoëne. 3. Five other books, whose right to rank among the oracles of God was not yet established in the beginning of the second century.

Origen's Catalogue.

And now, if, from the opening of the second century, we pass to the beginning of the third, an epoch so remarkable in the history of the church for the great thinkers who were then simultaneously raised up in the most distant countries of the empire: *Tertullian* in Africa, *Irenæus* in Gaul, *Hippolytus* in Arabia and at Rome, *Clement*, who closed his career in Africa when *Origen* was there just commencing his; and, soon afterwards, *Gregory* in the kingdom of Pontus, and *Cyprian* in Carthage; if, I say, we pass to this remarkable period, we shall receive, from the hands of the great Origen, a second catalogue.

[1] Versuch zur Verstellung des hist. Standpuncts für die Crit. der N. T. Schriften, chap. vi.

But, before opening it, it may be useful to consider how valuable in this matter is his testimony, from the character the piety, the learning, and the immense labors of this extraordinary man. Origen, notwithstanding some errors into which his piety was betrayed by his genius, is one of the greatest lights of ancient Christianity, by reason of his astonishing erudition, his skill in the sacred tongues, his respect for the Scriptures, his indefatigable ardor in studying them, the clearness of his expositions; as also the constant purity of his life, his faithful confession of Jesus Christ, and his holy firmness under persecution. If his dogmatic opinions on certain points have little worth, his testimony is of the highest value to us in the matter before us. His labors were, in fact, herculean. No other man has done so much to collect, compare, explain, and circulate the Scriptures. Born A. D. 185, he was made a martyr at sixty-eight years of age, A. D. 253. From his eighteenth year, he was distinguished for learning; he instructed the catechumens in Alexandria; and, soon after, was invited, young as he was, to take the pulpit of his master, the famous Clement of Alexandria. So popular were his public catechizings, that the most illustrious pagans attended them; and the emperor Alexander, pagan as he was, and his mother Mamæa, desirous of enjoying this privilege, when in Syria, sent a military escort to bring him to them at Antioch. He had visited the church in Rome when he was twenty-eight years old; and it was after his return to Alexandria that he undertook his vast labors on the Scriptures. He was compelled to leave Egypt A. D. 233, taking refuge first in Cesarea of Palestine, and then in Cesarea of Cappadocia. Eusebius says,[1] "So great was his desire to understand the Scriptures, that he procured the most authentic copies in the possession of the Jews, as well as the best editions of the Septuagint, or Greek version of the Old Testament, that of Aquila, those of Symmachus and Theodotion. He undertook to write a commentary on the whole

[1] Hist. Eccl. Lib. vi. chap. 23.

Bible." Eusebius, Epiphanius, and Jerome tell us:[1] "He has commented on the whole Bible." Eusebius continues: "Seven short-hand writers were at his side constantly while he was dictating. They were relieved at regular intervals; and, at the same time, an equal number of copyists, as well as several young girls, well practised in calligraphy, were at work, perfecting the books. The expenses of all this, and of his support, were provided by a friend who had been converted under his labors; so that he was free to be wholly given with an amazing zeal to the study of the divine oracles, and the publishing of his commentaries."

The abundance of his labors on the Scriptures seems to be superhuman; and it is not without reason that antiquity called him, "*The man with entrails of brass*," and "*The man of diamond*," (χαλκέντερος, Adamantius.) Also, although already in the time of Eusebius, that is, only a century after him, a large portion of his works had been lost, and although many others have disappeared since the time of Eusebius, the collection made by Huet;[2] of his remaining exegetical works, makes two volumes folio, while his complete works published by Delarue,[3] consist of four volumes. Without speaking of his famous *Hexapla*, or of his immense labors on all the books of the Old Testament, we may give an idea of what he has done for the New, by quoting from Eusebius,[4] and Cave,[5] the list of merely his *exegetical* works, his *Scholia*, (or collections of short notes,) his *volumes*, (or extended commentaries,) and his *homilies*, (or more popular treatises,) of which we have knowledge.

On the Gospel of John, thirty-two volumes of commentary, composed between A. D. 222 and 237, with many homilies, of which only two remain.

[1] Epiph. Hæres, chap. 64; Hist. Eccl. Lib. vi. chap. 23.
[2] Rouen, 1668, with a Latin translation.
[3] Paris, 1759.
[4] Hist. Eccl. Lib. vi. chap. 25.
[5] Hist. litt. Script. Eccl. p. 118. (Basle, 1741.)

On Matthew, twenty-five books of commentary, A. D. 244, besides scholia and many homilies.

On Luke, five volumes, besides thirty-nine homilies preserved by Jerome, in Latin.

On the Acts, homilies.

On Romans, twenty volumes of commentaries, part of which Rufinus has preserved to us in his Latin version.

On 1st Corinthians, Ephesians, and Colossians, many books of commentaries.

On Galatians, five volumes, besides treatises and scholia.

On 1st Thessalonians and Titus, exegetical works, preserved in part to us by Jerome and Pamphylus.

On Hebrews, commentaries, homilies, and exegeses.

On Revelation, an exposition of which he himself speaks in his treatise on Matthew, but of which we have no other trace.

It was necessary to enter into these details to show, by the labors of merely one man, what was already, only one hundred and twenty years after the death of John, the ardent desire of the churches to study the Scriptures of the New Testament; it was necessary to give an idea of the immensity of the researches made already, one hundred and three years before the council of Nice, by this great man, in reference to the sacred books; all this was necessary to justify the importance we attach to his testimony in regard to the canon historically considered.

Now the writings of Origen twice give us the catalogue of those books which were regarded in his time as canonical; first, by him directly, in the Eighth Homily on Joshua,[1] (preserved to us in Rufinus's Latin version), and then, indirectly, in the quotations of Eusebius, a hundred years after him.[2]

[1] Origen, Op. xii. p. 410 (Berlin, 1831). Version of Rufinus. Doubts are entertained of the accuracy of his translation of Origen. See, on this version, Canon, chap. iv. sec. iii.

[2] Hist. Eccl. Lib. vi. chap. 25.

Here is the catalogue, given to us casually by him in his commentary on the book of Joshua. It will be perceived that he describes our entire canon, without the omission or addition of a single book.

Alluding to the trumpets blown at the fall of Jericho, he says, "When our Lord Jesus Christ came, whom Joshua or Jesus the Son of Nun prefigured, he sent out his apostles as priests, bearing the trumpets of the magnificent and celestial doctrine of grace. First comes *Matthew*, who, in his Gospel, sounds the sacerdotal clarion. Then *Mark*, then *Luke*, then *John*, sounds each his own trumpet; then *Peter* after them blows the two trumpets of his epistles. Then *James*, as well as *Jude*. Then, notwithstanding his first blasts, *John* sounds others in his epistles and Apocalypse, as also *Luke*, when he describes the Acts of the Apostles. Finally comes in his turn he who said (1 Cor. iv. 9), 'I think that God hath set forth us the apostles last;' and when he sounds like thunder his fourteen epistles, the walls of Jericho fall from their very foundations, — all the defenses and weapons of idolatry's war, and all the dogmas of philosophy."

This first catalogue of Origen contains then, as we see, all the twenty-seven books of the New Testament, without one exception; but his testimony still in no wise contradicts the historical distinction we have made between the several books of the canon. All these books, we have said with Eusebius, were received by the majority (πλείστοις); all, we here see, were received by Origen; the twenty books of the first canon had never been contested by the Church, at that time, as they have never been since; nor do the two books of our second-first canon appear to have been doubted in the early part of the century, at the beginning of Origen's literary career; but they were soon going to be, the one in the East, the other in the West. And we shall see in the second form in which the catalogue has been preserved to us by Origen, that, if he himself admitted the second epistle of Peter, and the two shorter epistles of John, these two books

were still, for some of his cotemporaries, a matter of hesitation.

Here is the second form, as we receive it from Eusebius, who, in his sixth book of Eccl. Hist. chap. xxv. assures us he took it from the writings of this Father, to wit: from his first book on Matthew, his fifth book of exegesis on John, and one of his homilies on Hebrews.

He says, "Origen, faithful to the ecclesiastical canon, attests that there are but four gospels, in saying, 'See what I have learned from tradition regarding the four evangelists, who also are the only authors universally acknowledged without contradiction in the whole church of God.' Then, after having spoken of these four evangelists, he takes care, while showing his own firm attachment as before, to the canonicity of the other books of the New Testament, to distinguish the first epistle of Peter as incontestable (ὁμολογουμένην,) from the second, about which, others, he says, have doubts;[1] and he is equally careful to say of the two shorter epistles of John, that 'all do not regard them as genuine.'" As to the Apocalypse, it was still in his time universally received; and he alludes to no contradiction, when speaking of it. As to the epistle to the Hebrews, he indicates no doubt about its canonicity, only he remarks that "many, on account of its elegant style, question not (notice that) its *canonicity*, but its *Paulinity*." He expresses no opinion himself on that, and he is careful to add, that "if any church attributes it to Paul, they must honor it for that; for it is not in vain, or a light thing, that the men of ancient times have handed it down to us as Paul's production."

We may then conclude from this second catalogue of Origen, as from the first, that our historical division of the canon is legitimate; and we see yet again at the beginning of the third century,

1. That this great teacher received our entire canon.

[1] See Canon, chap. iv. sec. iii.

2. That then all the churches had continued to admit, without any contradiction, as they have ever since done, the twenty books of the first canon.

3. That they equally acknowledged the two books of our second-first canon.

4. That some persons doubted the canonicity of Peter's second epistle, and John's two smaller epistles.

5. But that Origen, according to Eusebius, speaks of no opposition in his day to the epistles of James and Jude Nor, indeed, does he there speak of his own acceptance of these divine epistles; but this is an evident oversight of Eusebius, since Origen more than fifteen times in his works alludes to the epistle of Jude, and calls it a *divine Scripture*.[1]

6. Finally, if many were led, in his day, by the beauty of the style of the Hebrews, to doubt Paul's authorship, yet that involved no doubt about its canonicity.

Eusebius's Catalogue.

The "Ecclesiastical History" of Eusebius, in which we find before the Nicean Council, at the commencement of the fourth century, our third catalogue of the New Testament, being so indispensable to us in the study of the canon, we would first fix our attention on the works of this author.

He was justly called "the father of ecclesiastical history;" for he was not merely the earliest, but also the only historian of the primitive church. Hegesippus, a hundred years before, had not known by any thing but "partial accounts" (μερικὰς διηγήσεις),[2] to relate the more or less uncertain traditions, of the apostolical times;[3] whilst Eusebius, collecting all the documents of the preceding ages, and consulting innumer-

[1] See Canon, chap. iv. sec. 5.

[2] It is the expression Eusebius employs. H. E. Lib. i. chap. 1.

[3] We may judge of his inaccuracy by the improbable or impossible stories which Eusebius has quoted; e. g. that of the life and death of James. See Hist. Eccl. Lib. ii. chap. 23; and Scaliger Animad. Euseb. p. 178.

able manuscripts, had undertaken to exhibit, in ten books, the successive labors, sufferings, and triumphs of the church, from the days of Jesus Christ to the fall of Licinius, A. D. 324. He adopted the rule, at the same time, of passing in review all the writings of the Fathers, now lost to us. Also Valesius (Henri de Valois), in the preface to his beautiful edition of the ecclesiastical histories,[1] remarks that "none of the succeeding historians of the church attempted to retrace this ground; but every one beginning where he ended, left him the entire glory of his work."

The ten books of Eusebius will then ever remain the great repertory where science must seek for almost all she can learn about the first three centuries; and the student of criticism or antiquity must constantly keep Eusebius before him, if he would refer to the sources, or speak pertinently of the early history of the canon. If his book had perished with so many others, the science of Christian antiquities, already so meager, would have been reduced to the most extreme penury; for it is a very remarkable fact, to which we shall again advert, that we have so few authentic documents relating to the first half of the second century, and the age of the apostles. When we have set aside, as we should do, the Shepherd of Hermas, the Apostolical Constitutions, and the pretended epistles of Barnabas, Ignatius, and Clement,[2] what remains? Only the five or six brief authentic letters of Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp, with the accounts of their martyrdoms, and the beautiful anonymous letter to Diognetus.

We have many other works of Eusebius written before his Ecclesiastical History. They are his "Evangelical Preparation," in fifteen books, written A. D. 315; his "Evangelical Demonstration," in twenty books (only ten remain), written about the same time; his precious "Chron-

[1] Eusebii, Socratis, etc. 3 vol. fol.; Moguntiæ, 1672, Pref. de Vita Eus. p. 9.

[2] See Patrum Apostol. Opera Josephi Hefele Proleg. Tubingæ.

icle," of which the text is lost, but an Armenian translation of it has been found; his "Apology of Origen;" his "Life (or panegyric) of Constantine;" his "History of the Martyrs of Palestine;" and many commentaries on the Scriptures. But his great work will ever be his Ecclesiastical History.

None was better qualified for this important work than this learned bishop. Born about A. D. 270; bishop from A. D. 315 of Syrian Cesarea, where his learned friend Pamphylus, Origen's successor, had taught and suffered martyrdom, Eusebius was at once a man of letters and a courtier, highly esteemed by the emperor Constantine, who often invited him to his imperial table, and honored him with his letters. He therefore had access to the archives of the State, as he had to the rich libraries established by Pamphylus in Cesarea, and at Jerusalem by Bishop Alexander. All these books, lost to our learned men, are known to them only by the fragments which Eusebius has quoted. The important works of Aristion, Quadratus, Aristides, Hegesippus, Papias, Meliton, Apollinarius, had all passed through his hands, so that, in forming his judgments on the Scriptures, he had advantages which we do not possess.

Eusebius, moreover, by his brilliant talents, as well as by his rank, exerted a great influence over the church. He was even offered the Patriarchate of Antioch, which he had the wisdom to refuse; and, in the famous Council of Nice, we see him at the right of the emperor's golden throne, and in the highest seat. We have in fact many of the emperor's letters to him. We quote from one connected with our subject.[1] "My dear brother, I trust to your prudence the care of having copied on precious parchments, and as you may find best adapted for the use of the church, and for the divine public readings (*παρὰ τῆς τῶν θείων ἀναγνωσμάτων ἐπισκευῆς*), fifty copies (*σωμάτια*) of the divine Scriptures (*τῶν θείων δηλαδὴ γραφῶν*). You will employ for this pur-

[1] Vita Constantini, Lib. iv. chaps. 35, 36.

pose the amanuenses and others most skillful in their art; and, to expedite the work, we have written in our clemency letters to the State Treasurer, and two public conveyances have been placed at your disposal."

It would be a precious treasure if Providence had preserved from time to time for the church, one of these old manuscripts, more ancient than ours, like those recently found in Nineveh and Egypt.

There is, then, nothing lacking in the testimony of this witness of the third and fourth centuries; but, before interrogating him, we must not forget that, in other respects, his judgment and his character are not always worthy of the same confidence as his erudition.

As to the latter, every critic, even his most severe detractor, fully concedes all we can claim.[1] (Jerome calls him[2] "a most learned man.") But he immediately adds, "I have not said catholic, but most learned." "Whom could you find," he says again, "more prudent, more learned, more eloquent than Eusebius, that admirer of Origen?"[3] Antipater of Bozra says, "We grant him science, but deny his theological skill."[4] Scaliger says: "If we call him *learned* who has read much, we can not refuse that honor to Eusebius. But if, to obtain it, it is requisite to unite judgment with reading, reserve this title for some one else." Antipater says, "That he was a man of great erudition, and that nothing in the oldest authors escaped his notice, is what I cheerfully accord to him; for, by the imperial favor, he was able to gather documents from every country."

It is important then, that, in giving all credit to the learning of Eusebius,[5] we should grant less to his judgment and

1 Valesius, Vet. Testimonia; (H. de Valois,) at the beginning of his Eusebius.

2 Lib. ii. adv. Rufinum.

3 Ep. 65, ad Pammachium et Oceanum.

4 Book i. against the Apol. of Origen, made by Eusebius.

5 We shall have to complain of him hereafter in reference to his treatment of Jude and Revelation.

his religious character. He had, during the imperial persecutions, led men to doubt his fidelity. The times were difficult; the philosophy of the last part of the third century had obscured his faith with that of many others, and prepared followers for the impieties of Arius, who, born in the same year with Eusebius, (A. D. 270,) had spread his poison from A. D. 312, and immediately found an army of accomplices in the bishops of his day. Among these was Eusebius. He publicly espoused the cause of Arius against the Bishop of Alexandria, and afterwards became one of the persecutors of Athanasius. Also, when, at the council of Tyre, (A. D. 335,) the Bishop Potamon, who had lost one of his eyes for the sake of the gospel, saw him sitting among the judges against this eminent servant of God, he could not suppress his indignation. "Is it then for you, Eusebius," he cried out with tears, "to sit in this place to condemn the innocent Athanasius? Who can bear the sight? Tell me, were we not both cast into prison by persecution? How, then, came you out safe and sound, whilst I lost an eye for maintaining the truth, if it is not that you have sacrificed to idols, or have promised to do it?"

The doctrinal statements of Eusebius, it is true, changed greatly after the council of Nice; but the times had changed. "There were doubts about his sincerity," says the historian Socrates.[1] Thus was he named the *double-tongued man* (δίγλωσσον); for he had not ceased even then to show himself the friend of the Arians and the enemy of the orthodox. Nevertheless, and whatever may have been his real character before God, his book will always have an inestimable value for the history of the canon. We even think that his prejudices against certain doctrines, and the philosophical and latitudinarian tendency of his mind, by inclining him to look mainly at the human side of the question, may, perhaps, render him a more valuable witness in an investigation of this kind; as has been said of Josephus

[1] Hist. Eccl. Lib. i. chap. 23.

and Gibbon in regard to the accomplishment of the prophecies.

Now Eusebius, in the twenty-fifth chapter of the third book of his history, gives us, with great precision, an exposition of the views of the ancient ecclesiastical writers in regard to the canon. To express it more precisely, he divides the Scriptures of the New Testament into books *recognized* and books *contested*. But, as this invaluable chapter is the starting point of almost all the works on the canon, we must fix with definiteness, before going farther, the meaning which Eusebius attaches respectively to these two expressions. From the etymology and common use of the words, we might suppose that by the recognized books, (ὁμολογουμένοι) Eusebius meant only the Scriptures recognized without dispute in any part of the churches of God; and that by the contested, (ἀντιλεγομένοι) he meant only the books not acknowledged. Yet this is not his meaning; for, with him, these distinctive terms relate only to the greater or less universal *extent* of the acceptance of these sacred books by the church.

Thus, then, in the mouth of Eusebius, the *homologomens* are "the Scriptures universally, absolutely, and constantly recognized from the beginning as divine by all the churches and all ecclesiastical writers." Thus you hear him giving them, in the same chapters, the titles of books *ratified* or *sanctioned* (κυρωτέον), books *catholic* or *universal* (καθολικά), books *intestamented*, or inserted in the collection of the New Testament (ἐνδιάθηκα), books *uncontroverted* (ἀναμφιλέκτα), books *uncontradicted* (ἀναντιῤῥήτα).

And, on the other hand, the *contested* or *antilegomens*, far from being, in the language of Eusebius, books not recognized, (as mere etymology would indicate,) designate books which, although recognized by the majority of the people and ecclesiastical writers, were not universally received, or received with some reservation and hesitation. Now, those books which Eusebius places among the recognized, "because

the ancient doctors and the ancient churches had constantly regarded them as divine," are not only the twenty books of which our first canon is composed, but also the two books which constitute our second-first canon; so that the class of the *recognized* would contain thirty-five thirty-sixths of the New Testament. It is certainly worth while to search here for the literal meaning of the expressions used by Eusebius. This is the title of his chapter: "*Of the recognized divine Scriptures and of those which are not;*" and he begins by saying, "It will be proper that at this point we should recapitulate the Scriptures of the New Testament which we have already made known. Now, we must rank in the first class the holy group of the four *Gospels*, which are followed by the Scripture of the *Acts of the Apostles*. After this Scripture, we must insert in the catalogue the *Epistles of Paul;* then that of *John*, which is called the first; and we must equally ratify also the *Epistle of Peter*. With these books must be ranked, if you will, *the Apocalypse of John*, on which we will take occasion to give our views. Such are then the books which belong to the recognized."

In the second place, the Scriptures which Eusebius places among the antilegomens are the five small epistles, the second of Peter, those of James and Jude, and the two last of John. "These contested Scriptures," he says, "which are yet recognized by the great number of the people and the majority of ecclesiastical writers, and publicly read with the other catholic epistles in the majority of the churches,[1] are exposed to some contradictions, and less cited by the ancient authors."

Outside of these twenty-seven books of the New Testament, and even of the contested books, Eusebius places the works which must be rejected, and which he calls (*νόθα*) or *illegitimate*. But at the same time he seems to have divided this third class into two others: that of the illegitimate which

[1] Lib. ii. chap. 23. He says these last words of the seven catholic epistles, with special reference to James and Jude.

may be harmless, or even edifying, but which are improperly attributed to Apostles or their companions, such as the *Acts of Paul*, the *Shepherd of Hermas*, the *Revelation of Peter*, the *Epistle of Barnabas*, the *Apostolical Constitutions;* — and that of the heretical and injurious illegitimate, which he calls absurd and impious, such as the *Gospels of Peter*, of *Thomas*, of *Matthias*, or the *Acts of Andrew*, of *John*, and the other apostles.

"We see," says Doctor Thiersch,[1] "by this subtle distinction which Eusebius establishes, which we could have deduced from neither the etymology of the terms nor the nature of the subject, how clear and positive the judgment of the church and the judgment of Eusebius then were on the proper limits of the canon; — limits which afterward became laws of the church."

If Eusebius included the epistle to the Hebrews among the books certainly and incontestably recognized, although he knew it to be the object of some doubts originating at Rome and dating only from the days of Caius or the first half of the third century, it was because he had seen it constantly admitted from the days of the apostles in all the Greek and Oriental churches. He took care to suggest "that while the fourteen epistles of Paul are manifest and certain, it would not be fair to overlook the fact that certain persons have rejected the epistle to the Hebrews because the Church of the Romans had denied that Paul was its author."[2] These *certain persons* were evidently Greeks; but neither their opinion, nor even that of the Church of Rome had really any weight with the churches of Greece and of Asia; and the learned Eusebius none the less declares that he regards this epistle as manifest and certain.

And as to the Apocalypse, we may at first be astonished that he does not place it among the *contested* books, since

[1] Versuch zur Verstellung des hist. Standpuncts für die Critic der N. T. Schr.

[2] Hist. Eccl. Lib. iii. chap. 3.

he speaks of it as divine in the view of some and false in the view of others. But as the divine origin of the Apocalypse had never been denied in the East, until Dionysius of Alexandria, in the middle of the third century, violently maintained that it was the work of a common priest named John, and consequently an illegitimate book, the dispute being still at its hight while Eusebius was composing his history, he could not, before the discussion had become calm, rank the Apocalypse in the class of *contested* books, since all were equally decided, but from opposite motives, to exclude it from this class; some to place it decidedly among the divine books, others, among those which are apocryphal.

The Apocalypse was regarded as divine to the middle of the third century; but then the party spirit of the philosophical theologians of Alexandria in their opposition to the ancient millenarian doctrine, dared for the first time to deny the authority of this book. This hostility caused the Greek teachers to suspend their judgment. Nor did Eusebius remain impartial in this strife, but he none the less presented the historical state of the question with a fidelity worthy of respect.

If, then, we are asked why Eusebius placed the epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse in the canon of the uncontested Scriptures, we should reply by recapitulating what we have just said, which is: —

1. Because these two books have from the beginning, and for two centuries, been recognized as divine by all the churches of the East and of the West.

2. Because from that time one of these books, the epistle to the Hebrews, has never ceased to be received in the Oriental churches, and the other, the Apocalypse, in the Occidental churches.

3. Because, when, at a later period and for a brief season, objections were raised in the East against the Apocalypse, and in the West against the Hebrews, they were never able to invoke against either of these two books the least testi-

mony of antiquity, and could oppose to them only the difficulties of doctrine and of style which are urged by the critics of our day.

We shall hereafter enter into a more precise consideration of these contested books, wishing here only to describe the catalogue of Eusebius.

In taking, then, our point of departure with so many others, from this historian, in establishing the divine canonicity of the entire New Testament, and in thus placing ourselves with this learned bishop in the year A. D. 324, five months before the council of Nice, we may say that we have chosen the precise moment of all history, in which the objections against these two books were at the culminating point. We could not then give a more exact statement of these objections than under this form, since our triple division of the canon surpasses in rigor even that of Eusebius; and that instead of placing with him the Hebrews and the Apocalypse in the rank of the uncontested books we assign them a separate position, as not having been really uncontested, in the absolute sense of Eusebius, until the middle of the third century. If you go upward from Eusebius, you see the objections diminishing; and if you descend from him you see them diminishing still more rapidly. The great Origen, before him, received, as we have said, our entire canon, and knew no hesitation among his cotemporaries excepting in regard to one eighty-ninth part of the New Testament; that is, Peter's second epistle and the last two of John. The great Athanasius, only twenty-six years younger than he, also received our entire canon, and said in terminating the catalogue of it[1]: — "These books are the fountain of salvation. Let no one then add to, or retrench from them any thing." And the famous council of Laodicea,[2] only thirty-nine years after

[1] In his *Festal Epistle* xxxix. Tom. ii. p. 961, edit. Bened.

[2] It represented the different countries of Asia, and it was approved by the fourth Œcumenical *Council of Constantinople* (in Trullo), by the fourth of *Chalcedon*, and by the *Imperial Law* of *Justinian*. *The Code of the Universal Church* itself places it in A. D. 364.

that of Nice, admitted already, and without exception, into its catalogues, as we shall presently see, all the five smaller, and later epistles which make our second canon.

It is then fully demonstrated that our division of the twenty-seven books of the New Testament into three historically distinct canons, meets the most severe requirements of sacred criticism, and that it represents very exactly the history of the several books of Scripture; — twenty books universally and constantly recognized without any contradiction, from the origin of the New Testament; then, two other books constantly and universally recognized also from the beginning to the middle of the third century, when they began to raise in one part of the church, and for one hundred and fifty years divers objections, not historical, but critical, to their canonicity; then, five brief epistles, recognized by the majority, still contested, however, in a part of the church, until the council of Nice.[1]

SECTION VIII.

OF THE COUNCIL OF NICE AND ITS RESULTS.

The œcumenical council of Nice is unquestionably one of the most august assemblies which the pageantry of human history presents to us. The world itself had never witnessed any thing comparable to it. The three hundred and eighteen bishops out of every country who composed it, and the elders and deacons assembled with them, were among the most learned and holy in the church of God. *Hosius*, bishop of Cordova, an old man venerated by all, who had already presided over other synods, and whose name was the first enrolled in this; *Eustathius*, bishop of Antioch, who opened the council with an address; *Alexander*, that pious bishop of Alexandria, who first combated Arius, and who took with

[1] See Canon, chap. i. sec. xii.

him to Nice the famous Athanasius, then a young deacon of Alexandria, twenty-nine years old; *James*, bishop of Nisibis in Mesopotamia; *Alexander*, bishop of Byzantium; *Marcellus*, bishop of Ancyra; *Macarius*, bishop of Jerusalem; *Cecilian*, bishop of Carthage. There were seen there even bishops from Persia, from Scythia, and the country of the Goths, as well as a great number of the glorious confessors of Jesus Christ who had suffered imprisonment and torture in the previous persecutions; three bishops named *Nicholas; Spyridion*, bishop of Cyprus, an aged man honored of all; *Paphnutius*, whose right eye had been taken out, and his left leg mutilated with a hot iron; *Paul*, of Neocesarea on the Euphrates, who was maimed in both hands, Licinius having ordered them to be burned. And besides these and so many other faithful men, the council contained a great many attached to the party of Arius, yet illustrious by their talents and their science, such as the two *Eusebiuses*, *Maris* of Chalcedon, *Paulinus* of Tyre, *Menophantus* of Ephesus, *Lucius*, a Sarmatian bishop, and many others. The assembly was opened in the imperial palace, on the 22d day of May, A. D. 325, and continued to the 25th of August. 3 mos & 3 days

The Council made no Decree on the Canon.

The canon of the New Testament is often spoken of as if the first general council, convoked by Constantine to put an end to the divisions then troubling the church, had enacted some decree on the sacred catalogue of the Scriptures. Nothing is less true.

We see then, it is true, as Eusebius[1] writes, "in this convocation of the œcumenical world, an assembly in which were gathered, from all the churches of Asia, Africa, and Europe, the most eminent spirits of the ministry of God on

[1] Eusebius, Life of Constant. Lib. iii. chap. 6. Socrates, Hist. Ecc. Lib. i. chap. 8.

earth." It is true, there were then taken resolutions concerning the disputes which were agitating the Christian world of the Orient and the Occident; and that frequent reference was made there to the Holy Scriptures, as to a book common to the churches universal; but there was never a question raised about any difference in regard to the canon. Not a document which has reached us from that council contains a word of such discussion.

In the midst of that august assembly an elevated throne was erected, and on that throne was laid the sacred volume of the gospels,[1] to signify, as was done in all the early general councils,[2] that the Scriptures are the supreme rule in all controversies. And the great Constantine, in his address to the assembled fathers,[3] reminded them that they had "the doctrine of the Holy Spirit written;" and "that the books of the evangelists and of the apostles, and the oracles of the prophets teach us clearly and certainly (σαφῶς) what we must believe concerning the things of God, so that all differences must be determined by reference to the divinely inspired words" (ἐκ τῶν θεοπνεύστων λόγων). In fine, the council, in accordance with its "Formula of Faith" (μαθήματος), attested that it founded its doctrines solely on the divine Scriptures (θείων γραφῶν), when, in its preamble proposed by Eusebius, it said, "As we learned in the Holy Scriptures, this is our creed: I believe in one only God, the Father Almighty," etc. But, we repeat, amid all these professions, the council never manifested the slightest thought of forming a decree on the sacred catalogue of the New Testament.

It is true that many Romanist theologians, Bellarmine,[4]

[1] Le Sueur, Hist. de l'Egl. et de l'Emp. tom. ii. p. 454; tom. iv. pp. 275, 375; tom. vi. p. 220. Πνεύματος τὴν διδασκαλίαν ἀνάγραπτοι ἔχοντας.

[2] This fact is affirmed of the council of Chalcedon and of many others. Yet I have not been able to find in Eusebius, any more than in Socrates, Sozomen, or Theodoret, the passage from which the historians have taken it in regard to the Council of Nice.

[3] See Theodoret, Histor. Ecclesiast. Lib. i. chap. 7.

[4] De Verbo Dei, Lib. i. chap. 10.

Baronius,[1] Catharinus,[2] Binius,[3] incessantly aiming at establishing the authority of human tribunals in matters of faith, and committed to the cause of the apocryphal books, have ventured some hazardous remarks on this point. In spite of the silence of antiquity, and regardless of all the monuments of the council of Nice which remain to us, they have pretended to find in one word of Jerome, the evidence that the council passed a decree on the canon. Jerome, in fact, earnestly importuned by certain persons to prepare a commentary on the book of Judith (the canonicity of which he firmly rejected), said, "But because the Synod of Nice is said to have reckoned this book in the number of the sacred Scriptures, I have yielded to your demand."[4] But it is easy to demonstrate the fallacy of this conclusion from his language. In fact —

1. No ancient ecclesiastical author ever appealed to the council of Nice on the scriptural canon.

2. Not a word is found on this pretended decree in the acts of the council.

3. Jerome is himself very explicit against the use of the book of Judith; and even in this preface from which the pretended argument is taken, he is careful to say that "the Hebrews put Judith among the books whose authority is of no weight in determining religious controversies."[5] And in his *Prologus Galeatus* he says, "This book is not in the canon." And in his commentary on the books of Solomon, "The church, it is true, reads it, but does not receive it among the canonical Scriptures."[6]

4. The Roman doctors are so fully convinced of Jerome's

1 Annals, tom. iii. sec. 137.

2 In Cajetan.

3 Notes on the Council of Laodicea.

4 It is in the preface to the book, "Sed quia hunc librum Synodus Nicæna, in numero S. Scripturarum legitur computasse," etc.

5 Cujus auctoritas ad roboranda illa quæ in contentionem veniunt minus idonea judicetur.

6 Sed eum inter canonicas Scripturas non recipit.

opinion on this point, that they decline his testimony when they are defending the apocryphal books.

5. Jerome, in the alleged passage, does not mean that the council approved the book of Judith; but simply "that certain persons had so pretended (*legitur*)." Possibly some bishop at Nice had made a quotation from the book; but that would not show that the council had recognized it to be canonical, much less, had made a decree on this subject.

6. If the council of Nice had approved this history of Judith as canonical, how could that of Laodicea, held forty years afterward, and recognized by the general council of Chalcedon, have excluded it from the canon? How could Eusebius and Athanasius, — both present and both powerful in the council of Nice; how could Epiphanius, who expressed such respect for this assembly; and how could Hilarius, who suffered exile in defense of its decrees, — how could all these four have equally excluded it? And how, again, could the great Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Amphilochius, all three nearer the time of the council than Jerome, have equally omitted it in their catalogue of the sacred books?

All Differences in Regard to the Contested Books ceased in all the Christian Churches after this Council.

Whatever may have been (by the special providence of God, as we shall hereafter show), the reserve of the councils in regard to the canon, — a reserve unconscious, and so much the more to be admired, — it is none the less true, that, from the time of the Nicean assembly, there was an immediate and marked change in the dispositions of those who had before manifested some uncertainty about this or that of the contested books. Hesitations immediately began to disappear, until, at last, the whole body of the Christian church reached that admirable unanimity which they have now manifested for fifteen hundred years among every tribe,

people, language, and nation. The council, without doubt, contributed powerfully, though indirectly, to this important result; because, by bringing together for three months, in intimate intercourse, the most illustrious and learned representatives of Christianity, opportunity was furnished for exchanging their views and comparing their respective manuscripts, and thus removing all unfounded prejudices, and recognizing their universal agreement.

It will, then, be proper to confirm these results by citations; but only to the fourth century, since from that time to the present, the testimonies are too continuous and abundant to be cited or counted.

SECTION IX.

THE ELEVEN AUTHENTIC CATALOGUES OF THE FOURTH CENTURY.

THE fathers and the councils of the fourth century have left us not less than eleven catalogues of the sacred books, without counting that of Eusebius.

All these, without exception, are unanimous in recognizing as canonical, not only the twenty books constituting our first canon, but also the Epistle to the Hebrews and all the five books which Eusebius calls *contested*, and which we have denominated the *Second Canon*. You will therefore hear, from the time of the Nicean Council, only one opinion throughout the world in regard to either the two canons, or the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Of these eleven authentic catalogues of the fourth century, nine are found in the writings of the fathers, and two in the decrees of councils. We shall, therefore, pass both classes in review in the following sections.

SECTION X.

THE NINE CATALOGUES OF THE FOURTH CENTURY GIVEN BY THE FATHERS.

Three of them omit only the Apocalyse.

Of these nine catalogues, there are three — those of Cyril, Gregory the theologian, and Philastrius — who, in agreeing fully on every other point with the canon of our churches, either do not name the Apocalypse, or, with Amphilochius, state that some still doubted its canonicity. Hug, in his Introduction, says, "Notwithstanding the unanimous opinion of the churches after the council of Nice, the discussions in opposition to the Millenarians, had been in some places too vivid, and in all too recent, for this book to have regained fully its place."

Cyril. — The first of these three catalogues is that of Cyril, whom the Greek Church places at the head of her saints, and who was elected patriarch of Jerusalem only twenty-four years after the council of Nice. He died A. D. 386. Before being promoted to that important post, he had successfully discharged the functions of catechist-pastor, even in Jerusalem.[1] His works consist almost exclusively of his eighteen Catechisms (or oral instructions), addressed to catechumens on the principal points of Christian doctrine; and of five catechisms called "Mystagogic,"[2] addressed to communicants on the two sacraments of the church. He says, "They were prepared in the simplest manner, to be understood of all." His term is *improvised* (σχεδιαθεῖσαι). Now, his catalogue is found in his fourth Catechism, under this title, "*Of the divine Scriptures.*"[3]

[1] We learn that he was still catechizing in A. D. 347. See his sixth Catechism, or (Cave, Hist. Litt. tom. i. p. 211).

[2] Published in Latin, at Paris, in 1564; in Latin and Greek, in 1720.

[3] Chap. 33, *et seq.*, ed. Bened. Venice, 1763.

He remarks, "See, then, what the inspired Scriptures of the Old and of the New Testament teach us; for there is in both the one only and the same God, who, in advance, announced in the Old the Christ of the New. Learn, then, from the church, with a docile spirit, what are the books of the Old and the New; and read me nothing from the Apocrypha. . . . Read the divine Scriptures, the twenty-two books of the Old Testament;[1] . . . but have nothing in common with the Apocrypha. Apply thyself earnestly only to those books which we also read and recognize in the church. They were certainly more enlightened and discreet than thou, the apostles and ancient bishops, those rulers of the church who have transmitted them to us. Thou, then, child of the church, do not put a false stamp on its ordinances (*μὴ παραχάραττε τοὺς θεσμούς.*)"

Thus much he says for the twenty-two books of the Old Testament.

"And as to the New Testament, all gospels besides the *four* are false and pernicious. The Manicheans,[2] also, have written a *Gospel according to Thomas*,[3] which, under the perfume of an evangelical surname, brings death to the souls of the simple. But receive also the *Acts* of the twelve apostles, and also the *seven catholic epistles of James, Peter, John, and Jude;* and, finally, as a seal put on all the disciples, the *fourteen epistles of Paul.* But let all the other books slide *out into a second rank.* And as to all the books not read nor recognized,[4] neither read nor acknowledge them for any thing that concerns thyself."

1 The Jews had the fancy of reducing the thirty-nine books to twenty-two, to correspond to their alphabet. They therefore made one book of the twelve minor Prophets, one book of Ruth and Judges, one of Ezra and Nehemiah, one of Jeremiah and Lamentations, one of the two books of Samuel, one of the two Kings, and one of the two Chronicles.

2 End of the third century.

3 They were not speaking here of Thomas, cotemporary with Jesus Christ, but of one Thomas, an immediate disciple of Manes (Cave, Hist. Litt. tom. i. p. 141).

4 We employ these two terms, because the Greek *ἀναγινώσκεται* includes both.

We see here, therefore, and shall again see it in the other catalogues, that they then considered two sorts of books as outside of the canonical Scriptures: those which, without being canonical, might be read in the churches, being placed in a second rank, and accordingly called *ecclesiastical books;* the others, which were not admitted even into this second rank, to be read in the churches, and which they denominated *apocryphal books.*

Cyril then, although conforming in every other point to the canon of our churches, had not yet admitted the Apocalypse to the place it occupied in the preceding centuries; but, with Eusebius, he gave it a secondary place, for he quotes it very clearly three times in his Catechism xv. chapters 12, 13, 17.

Gregory Nazianzen. The second catalogue is that of the celebrated Gregory of Nazianzum, born, as Cave thinks, at the time of the first œcumenical council, and promoted to the patriarchate of Constantinople about the time of the second, fifty-six years later. He died eight years afterwards, A. D. 389, aged 64 years.[1]

This great man, son of the bishop of Nazianzum, by whom he was ordained to the ministry, had finished his brilliant academic career in the schools of Cesarea, Alexandria, and Athens. He was already administering the diocese of Nazianzum during the old age of his father; and early made himself known by his fidelity as much as by the eminence of his gifts, when the council of Antioch commissioned him to repair to Constantinople in A. D. 378, to combat Arianism and raise the standard of God's truth. It was an arduous task; his life was more than once put in danger. The Arians had been possessors of all the temples for forty years, and their audacity was great; but Gregory had the happiness to bring a large number, in a short time, to the

[1] Fabricius differs from Cave in his dates; fixing his birth at 300 and death at 391. Bib. Græc. viii. 384.

profession of the truth. He assembled them at the house of one of his kindred, in an independent oratory, afterwards called the church of the Anastasis (or the Resurrection), "because the resurrection of the national church of Constantinople from the dead was there witnessed." An earnest multitude always attended his powerful preaching, until at length the Emperor Theodosius declared himself his protector, raised him to the patriarchate of Constantinople, with the unanimous assent of one hundred and fifty bishops convoked in an œcumenical council for this purpose. Yet, at the close of this assembly, the arrival of the Egyptian bishops at Constantinople having raised violent opposition to this election, Gregory, for the peace of the church, resigned his office, and went to finish his career in Cappadocia, in devotion, labor, and retirement.

A man of piety, an elegant poet, a preacher full of majesty, he was above all respected in his age as an unrivaled theologian. They accordingly gave him the surname, "Theologus." "Before the Lord and before the churches of God," says Rufinus,[1] "to raise one's self in any point against the teachings of Gregory, was to be a heretic." His writings have almost all come down to us. They consist of sermons, poetry, and letters.

Now his Catalogue, which is the sole theme of one of his songs,[2] is entitled: "*Of the legitimate* (γνησίων) *books of the inspired Scripture.* After a very exact enumeration of the books of the Old Testament (in his first nineteen verses), come these two distichs:

Ἀρχαίας μὲν ἔθηκα δύω καὶ εἴκοσι βίβλους,
Τοῖς Ἑβραίων γράμμασιν ἀντιθέτους.

Ματθαῖος μὲν ἔγραφεν Ἑβραίοις θαύματα Χριστοῦ,
Μάρκος δ' Ἰταλίᾳ, Λουκᾶς Ἀχαιιάδι.
Πᾶσι δ' Ἰωάννης κήρυξ μέγας, οὐρανοφοίτης . . .

[1] Prolog. in lib. Greg.
[2] It is the xxxiii. opp. tom. ii. p. 439. Colon. 1680.

"I have given the twenty-two books of the Old Testament corresponding to the letters of the Hebrew alphabet. Then Matthew wrote for the Hebrews the marvelous things of Christ, Mark for Italy, Luke for Greece, but John for all; — he, this great herald-at-arms who has entered the heavens. Then the Acts of the Apostles, and the fourteen letters of Paul, and the seven Catholic Epistles; one of James, two of Peter, and three of John; that of Jude being the seventh. Thou hast them all; and if any other is proposed to thee, it is not in the number of the legitimate (*οὐκ ἐν γνησίοις*)."

We see, then, the canon of Gregory is already complete, with the single exception of the Apocalypse. And yet this father (in his twenty-fourth verse) clearly enough refers to the apostle John as the author of this book, when he names him "the great herald who has entered the heavens." Thus too Andreas, bishop of Cesarea, who commented on the Apocalypse toward the close of the fifth century, declares that Gregory the divine regarded the Apocalypse as a sacred book and worthy of faith.[1] And we read in Lardner[2] two passages in which this same Gregory refers to the Apocalypse of John. Once he says: "As John teaches me by the Apocalypse" (*Ὡς Ἰωάννης διδάσκει με διὰ τῆς Ἀποκαλυψέως*). And again, when he cites this eighth verse of the fourth chapter of the Apocalypse: *Καὶ ὁ ὤν, καὶ ὁ ἦν, καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ὁ Παντοκράτωρ.*

However it may be, we are disposed rather to believe that, with Cyril and Eusebius, Gregory Nazianzen, at this epoch, did not yet place this holy book in the rank of the canonical books, properly so called, and gave it only a second rank among the ecclesiastical books in the public reading in the churches.[3]

[1] Bibl. Pat. Max. v. 590. Constat namque beatos illos viros, . . . Gregorium theologum, Cyrillum Alexandrinum, etc. . . . divinum fideque dignum non uno loco tradere.

[2] Tom. iv. p. 287. .

[3] We find, among the works of the same father, another catalogue which some attribute to Amphilochius, and of which we shall speak hereafter. Canon, chap. i. sec. xi.

PHILASTRIUS. The third catalogue is that of Philastrius, a friend of Ambrose, and bishop of Brescia. He flourished about A. D. 380. He had traveled much to promote the truth, and had valiantly combated against Arianism. Augustine mentions his meeting him at the house of Ambrose.[1] There remains to us one of his books, "De Hæresibus," which is found in the fifth volume of the great Library of the Fathers.[2] In the 40th and 41st articles of this book we find his Catalogue of the New Testament, as here quoted: "Article 40. It has been established by the apostles and their successors, that nothing should be read in the churches except the Law and the Prophets, the Gospels, the Acts, the thirteen epistles of Paul, and seven others, two of Peter, three of John, one of Jude, and one of James. As to the concealed or apocryphal scriptures, although they may be read by the perfect for their sanctification, they should not be read by all, because ignorant heretics have added and cut out much in them at their pleasure."

To read, then, only this 40th article, we should suppose that Philastrius, while accepting our first and second canons entirely, did not accept our second-first; but this would be a mistake so far as regards the epistle to the Hebrews; for, in his 41st article, entitled: "Heresy of some concerning the Epistle to the Hebrews," he adds:

"There are others who pretend that the letter of Paul to the Hebrews is not his, but from Barnabas, or Clement, bishop of Rome. Others, too, that Luke had written a letter to the Laodiceans, and because evil-minded persons have added some things to it, it is not read in the church; or if sometimes read, yet not always. It is because he has there written in a beautiful style, that they have thought it was not from him; and because he calls Christ '*made of God*,' (Heb. i. 4,) that some do not read it; and it is with others still, in view of the Novatians, because he speaks as he does of repentance in Heb. vi. 4, *et seq.*"

[1] At the commencement of his work "De Hæresibus."
[2] Bibl. Pat. Max. p. 711.

We see, then, the catalogue of Philastrius (the third and last of those of the fourth century which still place the Apocalypse outside of the canon) ranks at the same time among the heretics those who deny the Pauline origin of this epistle. Only, as to himself, while admitting it to the canon, he is careful to indicate the three internal reasons why many of the Latins refused it that rank. We shall need to return to this subject in our third chapter.

All the Six other Catalogues of the Fathers of the Fourth Century are entirely conformed to that of our Churches.

All the other catalogues of the fourth century, given by the fathers, were already identical with those which the church has accepted, now for fifteen hundred years. They are: that, 1. Of the great Athanasius, only twenty-six years younger than Eusebius; 2. Of another cotemporary father, whose name is unknown to us; 3. Of Epiphanius, archbishop of Salamis in Cyprus, and only fourteen or, as some say, four years younger than Athanasius; 4. Of Jerome, secretary of Pope Damasus, and thirty-five years younger than Epiphanius; 5. Of Rufinus, priest of Aquillia, the intimate friend of Jerome before becoming his enemy, and instructed like him in all the learning of the East and West by his sojourn in Jerusalem, from A. D. 371, and at Rome, from A. D. 396; 6. Of Augustine, the holy bishop of Hippo, twenty-three years younger than Jerome.

It will be well to pass each in rapid review.

Athanasius. The testimony of this eminent man is of the greatest importance, on account of his rank, his attainments, and the whole history of his life. He was unquestionably the most illustrious person of this epoch, not only on account of his fidelity, his science, his firmness and clearness of mind so much admired in all his works (λέγειν τε καὶ νοεῖν

ἱκανόν, says Sozomen[1]), but also because his incessant struggles against Arius and the powers of the age, almost all favorable to the heresy of Arius, filled up fifty years of his life, and obliged him to wander through every part of the kingdom. From Alexandria he must go to Tyre, Constantinople, Rome, Belgium, and the deserts of the Thebaid. Born A. D. 296, as is believed, he lived more than eighty years, and was bishop more than half a century. We know to what advantage he appeared in the œcumenical assembly of Nice; and how, in spite of his youth, (being not yet thirty years old,) he was called, only five months after the council, to the patriarchate of Alexandria. Persecuted by the two Eusebiuses, more than once deposed, expelled, even condemned to death, he had opportunity in his long journeys and exiles of knowing better than any other man the view of all the churches of the East and West in regard to the Scriptures. So that his testimony is certainly one of the most sure representations which we can obtain of the thought of the universal church in the fourth century. "His life is the model of the episcopate," says Sozomen;[2] "and his doctrine the law of orthodoxy."

Now we may see already the difference, as to the firmness of his faith in all the Scriptures, between his language and that of Eusebius his cotemporary, but the friend of Arius.

In his Festal Epistle,[3] he says: "As to us, we have for our salvation the divine Scriptures; but I fear that, as Paul wrote to the Corinthians, a small number of the simple are turned away from simplicity and from holiness by the wicked malice of men, and have come to reading the apocryphal books, deceived by the assumed names of the true books. I believe then it would be useful to the church

[1] Lib. ii. chap. 17. Edit. of Valois, p. 466.

[2] Cave (Script. Eccl. tom. i. p. 191) cites Sozomen, p. 397; but we have not been able to find these words there.

[3] Epître Festale xxxix. tom. ii. p. 961, edit. Ben. Paris, 1698.

to enumerate them; but, to do it, I must borrow the words of Luke, and say,[1] 'Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order' a list of the apocryphal books, and to mingle them with the inspired Scriptures which is 'most surely believed among us, even as they delivered them unto' the fathers, 'which from the beginning were eye-witnesses, and ministers of the word; it seemed good to me also,' urged by true brethren, to set in order the books held as canonical, and transmitted and believed to be divine books, that whoever may have been led into error may condemn his false guides."

Then follows the list of the Old Testament. He adds, "But I must not neglect to show also those of the New. They are, the four Gospels, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; after these, the Acts of the Apostles, and the seven catholic epistles, said to be of the apostles, as follows: one of James, and two of Peter; then, three of John, and after that, one of Jude. There are, besides, fourteen of Paul, written, as to their order (*τῇ τάξει γραφόμεναι οὕτως*), one to the Romans; then two to the Corinthians; then to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, two to the Thessalonians, and the Epistle to the Hebrews; then also afterward, two to Timothy, one to Titus, and the last, to Philemon; and finally, the Apocalypse of John."

We take pleasure in giving an exact translation of these catalogues, notwithstanding the repetition it involves, because it impresses on the reader the firmness with which, from the beginning, the order (*τάξις*) of the books was transmitted in the church, although not conformed to their chronology. This fact, we shall show, is not without significance in the history of the canon.

Athanasius adds, "These books are the fountains of salvation, that whoever thirsts may there slake his thirst at the oracles which they contain; for it is in these books alone that the school of piety is evangelized (*ἐν τούτοις μόνοις τὸ*

[1] Luke i. 1–3, paraphrased.

τῆς εὐσεβείας διδασκαλεῖον εὐαγγελίζεται). Let no one add to or retrench from them. . . .

"But, for greater exactness, we must necessarily add that besides these books there are others which are not canonized, it is true (οὐ κανονιζόμενα μέν), but which have been marked by the fathers to be read by those who, recently come among us, are desirous of being instructed in the word of piety: the Wisdom of Solomon and the Wisdom of Sirach, and Esther,[1] Judith, and Tobit, the Institutions called Apostolical, and the Shepherd. Those, beloved, were regarded as canonical, these as readable; while no mention must be made of the apocryphal books. They are an invention of the heretics, who have written them to their own taste, and have affixed to them ancient dates, to deceive the simple."

We then clearly perceive that the collection of Athanasius is complete, as was that of Origen, one hundred and fifty years before him. But there had already been established the custom of reckoning, outside of this collection of twenty-seven canonical books, two kinds of writings: first, a small number called ecclesiastical, or to be read in the churches; and secondly, others carefully distinguished as apocryphal. We shall meet this distinction again in other catalogues.

Anonymous. The second catalogue is by a cotemporary of Athanasius, often confounded with him. It is found in Greek in the collection of his works, under the name of "Synopsis of the Holy Scripture."[2] Its compilation is admired: "a model of care, sagacity, and learning," say the Benedictines. Here it is; — "All the Scripture of us Christians is inspired. It is composed, not of undefined books, but rather of books determined and recognized as canonical. First are those of the Old Testament;" which he gives.

[1] The seven apocryphal chapters are added to the book of Esther after the tenth chapter. Having in view here only the New Testament, we shall not linger on this detail.

[2] Tom. ii. p. 125, edit. Bened. Paris, 1698.

"Then, the determined and canonized books of the New Testament, the," etc., giving our catalogue, though not in the same order. "Such are the books of the New Testament, books canonized, and as it were, the first-fruits, the anchors and props of our faith, inasmuch as they were written by the very Apostles of Jesus Christ, and left in charge by them" (καὶ ἐκτεθέντα.)

Epiphanius. The third catalogue, that of Epiphanius, is found in his "*Panarium*," or book against the heresies.[1]

The writings of this father, born in Palestine and of Jewish extraction, are likewise of great weight in the history of the canon, because of his vast literary acquirements, and his acknowledged skill in ecclesiastical antiquities.[2] He was a man of five languages, *pentaglossal*, as Jerome[3] calls him, master alike of Hebrew, Syriac, Egyptian, Greek, and Latin. His book against the heresies, Photius[4] says, is richer and more useful than any before written on the same subject, on account of his abundant quotations from Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Hippolytus, and other ancient authors. Jerome[5] says, "His writings are read and reread by the learned, on account of the substance; and by the unlearned, on account of their form."

Brought up in Egypt, and converted to gnosticism before he had reached the age of twenty, he returned to his own country, in order to place himself under the direction of the celebrated Hilarion, teacher of the monastic life in Palestine. He himself had afterwards founded the monastery of Ad, of which he was chief, when called to the important see of Salamis in Cyprus. It was particularly in this maritime and commercial town that he acquired a precocious celebrity by his discourses and writings, as well as his fidelity in doctrine

[1] LXXVI. p. 941, edit. Petav. Colon. 1682.
[2] Cave, tom. i. p. 232.
[3] Apol. i. adv. Rufin. p. 222; Apol. ii. p. 233.
[4] Cod. 122.
[5] De Script. Eccl. chap. 114.

and purity of life. This life was very long; filling the entire century; some say even that in A. D. 402, when he died, he had gone beyond the age of one hundred years.[1] So that, born in the third century, he lived to see the fifth, after thirty-six years in the episcopate. We see him occupying an important post at Rome and at Constantinople, contending with great firmness against the evil tendencies of his times, especially the heresy of Arius, as well as the growing use of images, and the too accredited errors of Origen. Hence his debates with John of Jerusalem, and even the illustrious Chrysostom, whom he reproached for leniency toward error. He himself was censured for having made too much of tradition.

These are his words on the canon:[2] "If thou hast been born of the Holy Spirit and taught by the prophets and apostles, it must have been that, in going from the origin of the world to the times of Esther, thou hast read the twenty-seven books of the Old Testament (reckoned by the Jews as twenty-two), and the four holy Gospels, and the fourteen epistles of the holy apostle Paul, with the Acts of the Apostles, and also the catholic epistles of James, Peter, John, and Jude, and the Apocalypse of John, and also the two books of Wisdom, that of Solomon and that of the son of Sirach; in a word (ἁπλῶς), all the divine scriptures."

Such is the exact and complete catalogue of Epiphanius, as to the New Testament; for, to avoid complication, we will not here touch the Old, nor speak of his error in recommending the apocryphal books Ecclesiasticus and the Wisdom of Solomon. In his day they were placed in a separate class (as we shall see in the catalogue of Rufinus); they were called ecclesiastical; admitted to be read in the churches,

[1] Polybius, his disciple, and companion of his last journey to Constantinople, says he told the emperor Arcadius that he had reached to one hundred and fifteen years and three months. — Cave, Hist. Litt. tom. i. p. 252.

[2] Epiph. adv. Hæres. lxxvi. p. 941, edit. Petav.

and distinguished from the apocryphal books. Epiphanius[1] says, "Beside the twenty-seven books which God gave to the Jews, there are also, independently of the apocrypha, two others which are contested by them (ἐν ἀμφιλέκτῳ), the Wisdom of Sirach and that of Solomon. These two books are certainly useful,[2] but not related to the number of those which may be published (or fixed and agreed upon); and it is therefore they were not put apart in the ark of the covenant."

JEROME. The fourth catalogue is that of Jerome.

This famous divine is, without contradiction, of all the fathers of the fourth century the best qualified to be heard on the canon of the Scriptures, not for his candor or spiritual understanding of the gospel; not for his character or his temper, nor even for his respect for the sacred authors, for his language in this respect is often very improper; but for his constant clearness, his knowledge of Hebrew and Greek, his learning, his travels, his immense labors, and his long residence in Palestine, where he was constantly occupied in making researches concerning the sacred books.

This celebrated man, who is equally Occidental and Oriental, was raised up by God to spread great light through the church, by his recommending the study of the text in the original languages, and by thus bringing back, especially the Latins and Greeks, to the pure sources of the word of truth. He also, like Epiphanius, accomplished a long career, dying A. D. 420, at the age of eighty-nine years. Born in upper Dalmatia, he went from Aquileia to Rome to prosecute his studies under the eloquent Victorinus of Africa, whence he departed for his first journeys, passing throughout France, visiting everywhere the libraries, going even to Trèves to meet Hilary, and returning by Aquileia in Venice to see Rufinus; then going to Thrace, Asia, and even Antioch,

[1] Adv. Hæres. v. p. 19, edit. Colon. 1687.
[2] De Mensuris, p. 180.

in order to spend four years there in the solitude of the desert, and there to give himself entirely to the study of the Holy Scriptures in their original languages. He was not ordained priest until he was forty-nine years old; but already celebrated throughout the Empire, he went to Constantinople a little before the second œcumenical council held there A. D. 381. He attended with ardor on the instructions of Gregory Nazianzen, until he left the city, and went, accompanied by Epiphanius and Paulinus, to Rome, where he lived three years, and where Bishop Damasus gave him the office of his private secretary. In the mean time, profoundly disgusted with that city after the death of Damasus, he left it for ever A. D. 385; went to visit Epiphanius in Cyprus; passed from thence to Jerusalem, and the next year to Egypt, where he listened to the instructions of the illustrious Didymus; until at length, returned to Palestine, he went to make his long and last retreat in Bethlehem. It was there that, during thirty-three years, were performed the greater part of his immense labors, and that, visited by distinguished persons from all parts, he became the oracle of his age.

Now Jerome has given us under several forms his sacred catalogue; and it may be said even, that the first volume of his works is itself a catalogue. It is called *Divinam Hieronymi Bibliothecam;* because it contains all the books of the Holy Scripture, translated by Jerome from the Hebrew or the Greek, and preceded by important prefaces.[1] It is divided into three parts: the first containing the Hebrew canon, or the Pentateuch, the Prophets, and Hagiographa; the second containing some books of the Old Testament, which Jerome had translated from Chaldaic or from the Greek of the Septuagint; the third containing all the books of the New Testament, with prologues and abundant notes. In his prologue to the seven epistles, the author states that having found in the Latin manuscripts the epistle of Peter displaced and put before the others (by a mistaken jealousy

[1] Cave, Hist. Litt. tom. i. p. 269.

for the supremacy of that apostle), he had taken care to replace it in its rank, "that it might be in conformity with the order always observed by the Greek manuscripts;" and he warns us, at the same time, that unfaithful translators had cut out from John's first epistle the passage of the three that bear witness in heaven. Some have denied that Jerome wrote this prologue. But we can not now delay to discuss that question.

Besides this, Jerome has directly given us, and more than once, his catalogue: first, in his book *De Viris Illustribus*,[1] written A. D. 392, and afterwards in his epistle to Paulinus,[2] written A. D. 397.

These are his words in this letter: "I shall merely touch the New Testament. We have there first Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, the Lord's four-wheeled chariot, the true cherubim" (alluding to the vision of Ezekiel). "Then Paul writes to seven churches; for the eighth, to the Hebrews, is placed by most of the Latins out of this number. He writes to Timothy and to Titus; he recommends to Philemon a fugitive slave. . . . The Acts of the Apostles appear to meet the infancy of the growing church; but when we shall have learned that its author was a physician, 'whose praise is in all the churches,' we shall also be assured that all his words are the medicine of the languishing soul. The apostles James, Peter, John, and Jude have published also seven epistles, mystical but succinct, at once short and long, short in words, long in sense. . . . The Apocalypse of John has as many mysteries as words. I have said little of it in comparison with its merit. In every word are many latent meanings."

We then see Jerome, with all the others, receiving the seven uncontested and contested epistles; for him their four authors are all apostles; he exalts the Apocalypse, and equally indicates the fourteen epistles of Paul, contenting

[1] Cap. v. (opp. tom. iv.)

[2] Tom. iv. p. 574, edit. Bened. (Martianay), Paris, 1693.

himself with saying of the Hebrews, "the greater part of the Latins exclude it." But he is very far from excluding it himself; for he is careful to repeat many times in his writings that he regards it as canonical, and attributes it to Paul. He wrote to Dardanus,[1] about A. D. 414, "It must be said to ours (the Latins) that this epistle to the Hebrews is not only received by the Oriental churches as from Paul, but also by all the Greek ecclesiastics of former days, although many[2] attribute it to Barnabas or Clement. And it must also be said that it is of little consequence who the author was, since he was an ecclesiastic, and since it is daily read publicly in the churches. And if the Latin usage does not receive it among the canonical Scriptures, and if, on the other hand, the Greek churches do exclude the Apocalypse which the Latins receive, yet, as to ourselves, we shall accept them both, for we mean to follow, not the custom of the day, but the authority of the ancient authors."

RUFINUS. The fifth catalogue is that of Rufinus, priest of Aquileia.

For a long time the friend of Jerome, he pursued with him his first studies in the schools of Aquileia; traveled, as he did, in the East, (about A. D. 371,) visited Egypt also; united himself there to Didymus; established, like him, a monastery in Palestine, in which he passed twenty-five years; but, having become the enemy of Epiphanius from zeal for the memory and doctrine of Origen, he drew on himself the hatred of Jerome, and returned to Italy A. D. 397, to die in Sicily A. D. 410.[3]

His catalogue, found in his "Exposition of the Apostolical Symbol,"[4] is so remarkable for the distinctness and precision of its language that we shall translate the most of it.

[1] Tom. ii. p. 608, edit. Paris.

[2] Since Mr. Gaussen's word "laplupart" would make a contradiction. We venture to render it by "many."—*Tr.*

[3] Cave, Hist. Litt. p. 286.

[4] In Cyprian's works, p. 26, edit. of Amsterd. 1691.

"It is the Holy Spirit, who, in the Old Testament, inspired the Law and the Prophets, in the New Testament, the Evangelists and Apostles. Also the apostle says, 'All Scripture given by inspiration of God is profitable for instruction.' Wherefore it seems to me suitable here to designate by a clear enumeration, as we have learned from the monuments of the fathers, what are the books of each Testament, (Instrument,) which, according to the tradition of the ancients, are regarded as inspired by the Holy Ghost, and transmitted to the churches of Christ. . . . In the New Testament there are four Gospels, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; the Acts of the Apostles described by Luke; fourteen epistles of the apostle Paul; two of the apostle Peter; one of James, apostle and brother of the Lord; one of Jude; three of John, and the Apocalypse of John. Such are the books which the fathers have included in the canon, and on which they have endeavored to lay the foundations of our faith. . . . .

"In the mean time it must be known that there are also other books which the ancients (*a majoribus*) called not canonical, but ecclesiastical. Such are the Wisdom of Solomon, and another Wisdom, entitled of the son of Sirach, as well as the little book of Tobit and Judith, and the books of the Maccabees. In the New Testament, the little book called The Shepherd of Hermas, (also The Two Ways, or The Judgment of Peter). As to all these books, they have wished them to be read in the churches, it is true; but not that they should be quoted as authority to establish the faith (*non tamen proferri ad auctoritatem ex his fidei confirmandam*). As to the other scriptures, they have called them apocryphas, and have not permitted them to be read in the churches. . . . .

"I have judged proper," Rufinus adds, "to mention here, for the instruction of those who are not in the rudiments of the church and of the faith, these facts which we hold from the fathers; in order to show to all from what fountain of the word of God they should fill their cups."

See then again the careful distinction already noticed, by Athanasius and Epiphanius, between three sorts of books: canonical, to the number of twenty-seven and divinely inspired; ecclesiastical, to be read in the churches for edification only; and apocryphal, which are never to be read there.

AUGUSTINE. The sixth and last catalogue of the fathers of the fourth century, still entirely conformed to our canon, is that of the sublimest and the profoundest of the ancient doctors, the illustrious bishop of Hippo. He is the most recent of the fathers that we propose to quote in this research; for, about a hundred years younger than Eusebius, he belongs to the fourth and fifth, as Eusebius belonged to the third and fourth, centuries.

Born of Christian parents in Numidia A. D. 355, but early entrapped, in spite of his mother's tears, by the sad doctrines and immoralities of Manicheism, he was publicly teaching rhetoric in Carthage when, at the age of twenty-eight years, leaving Africa, he went to Rome and afterwards to Milan. It was in this city that his relations with the illustrious Bishop Ambrose, who received him with great cordiality, withdrew him from his errors; but it was not till A. D. 388, when he had reached the age of thirty-three years, that he was brought out of darkness into light by a manifest act of the divine power. The next year he returned to Africa to pass three years of retirement under his father's roof; after which he was consecrated to the sacred ministry at the age of thirty-six years, to be called five years afterwards to the episcopal see of Hippo. He died A. D. 430, at the age of seventy-five years, shut up in the city of Hippo, while besieged from sea and land by the Vandals, then masters of Africa. This admirable man, who had never ceased, during his long career, to labor by powerful writings for the defense of the doctrines of grace and the edifying of the churches of God throughout the earth, was raised up not only to overthrow in his age the heresy of Pelagius, but to project and

leave after him on all the ages of the church a beneficent track of light. His works form a collection of eleven folio volumes.[1]

His "City of God," his commentaries on the Psalms, his sermons, his letters, his retractions, his confessions, his tracts on sin, and on grace, universally commend themselves by two features: the devotion continually manifesting itself, and the method of argument, which should ever serve as a model to theologians, as it is a continued development of the word of God, by the word of God. He was a pillar of the house of God, and he remains a shining light.

Here then is his catalogue as found in his book "De Doctrinâ Christianâ,"[2] one of the last of his works, begun A. D. 397 and finished A. D. 426.[3] We omit for the present what he says about the Old Testament, and quote only his testimony upon the New. "Here," he says, "are the books in which the authority of the New Testament is included (*terminatur auctoritas*). Four books of the Gospel (according to Matthew, Mark, Luke, John), fourteen epistles of Paul the apostle (to the Romans, to the Corinthians two, to the Galatians, to the Ephesians, to the Thessalonians two, to the Colossians, to Timothy two, to Titus, Philemon, Hebrews), two of Peter, three of John, one of Jude, and one of James, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Apocalypse."

SECTION XI.

SOME OTHER CATALOGUES PRETENDING TO BE OF THE FOURTH CENTURY, AND CONFORMED TO OUR CANON, ARE APOCRYPHAL OR FORGED.

BESIDES these nine catalogues of the fathers of the fourth century, there are three others that have an insufficient title

[1] The best edition, that of the Benedictines (Paris, 1679 *et seq.*), was reprinted at Antwerp, 1700–1703, and Paris, large 8vo., 1835–1840.

[2] Lib. ii. vol. iii. part i. n. 13, p. 47, edit. Paris, 1836.

[3] Cave, Hist. Litt. tom. i. p. 290, *et seq.*

to our confidence, the one being uncertain and the other two forged.

As in our sixth section on the second century we have not quoted the book of the Apostolical Canons[1] because it is apocryphal, although they pretend to give, in the name of the apostles, "to all clergymen and laymen the catalogue of the august and holy books of the Old and the New Testament," and which already contained the fourteen epistles of Paul, and the seven apostolical epistles; so also in this present chapter, we abstain from mentioning the three catalogues of the fourth century which are attributed respectively to Pope Innocent I., to Pope Damasus, and to Bishop Amphilochius, because we regard the first as doubtful, and the other two as forged.

So it is in the next century, with that which one ascribes to Gelasius, but of which not the least mention is made in the monuments of history before the time of Isidore the merchant, in the ninth century.

The Catalogue of Innocent I.

And first, Pope Innocent I. (bishop of Rome A. D. 402) is presented to us as having given, about the close of the fourth century, a catalogue of the sacred canon. This catalogue agrees entirely with ours as to the New Testament, but as to the Old, it was invented in order to recommend the apocryphas.

We find it in a pretended epistle of Innocent to Exuperus,[2] bishop of Toulouse; but this epistle is pronounced entirely spurious by William Cave,[3] for the following reasons: 1. The barbarity of the style, which could not have belonged to the

[1] To the number of eighty-five. Athanasius calls it ἡ Διδαχὴ τῶν ἀπο στόλων. At first very small, this book grew in bulk as it grew in age. See Patres Apost. Cotler. i. p. 453, 480, edit. Amsterd. 1724.

[2] Tom. ii. p. 1256, third Paris edit. 1671.

[3] Hist. Litt. tom. i. p. 379.

age of Innocent; 2. Its absurd applications of Scripture; 3. Its doctrinal errors, errors evidently anticipated; 4. Its very gross anachronisms; 5. The mention of rites not yet existing in the church. That, moreover, which proves the fraudulent character of this decree, is, that the council of Carthage, distrustful of its own judgment, decided to consult Pope Boniface, who reigned only sixteen years after Innocent. Would the council have consulted him if a decree of Innocent had been issued sixteen years before? Bishop Cosin [1] says that mention was never made of this letter until Innocent had been dead for three hundred years; and no mention was made of any catalogue in this epistle until a century after it appeared!

The ancient church was governed for a long time by what was called "The Universal Code of the Canons;" a code which was afterward confirmed by the emperor Justinian, and which, composed by four general and five provincial councils, contained two hundred and seven canons. These canons were there arranged in exact order, so that the number could be neither increased nor diminished; and thus it continued until the time of Dionysius the Less, abbot of Rome, deceased A. D. 540. He assumed the task of translating it from Greek into Latin, and of making alterations favorable to the pretensions of the popes. He cut out, for instance, the eight canons of the council of Ephesus, a large part of the last canon of Laodicea, the last three of Constantinople, the last two of Chalcedony; and he added many others [2] of which the Christian church knew nothing. And yet, let it be observed, no decretal epistle of the popes had yet appeared; so that, for a hundred years, there was no mention, even in the Roman code, of any epistle of Innocent. It was not then until two hundred years after Dionysius, and three hundred after Innocent, that an abridgment of the canons (Brevarium Canonum) composed A. D. 689, by Cresconius, an African bishop, added

[1] On the Canon, p. 118, 130.

[2] For instance, the canons called "apostolical."

to the code of Dionysius the Less the decretal epistles of six popes, and among the others this epistle to Exuperus. And even then, this pretended epistle of Innocent did not yet contain his pretended catalogue; for it was not until a century after Cresconius, or four hundred years after Innocent, that Isidorus the merchant, in the year 800, made his collection of the decretals; "a collection," says Cosin, "which no honest man would have consented to use, until the popes, Leo IV. (A. D. 850) and Nicholas I. (A. D. 860), seeing the powerful aid they would furnish the papal cause, published them as a law." [1]

We have entered into these details only to avoid repetition when we shall come to speak of the false decretals, and of the injurious use made of them in the question of the apocryphal books.

The Catalogue of Damasus.

For similar reasons we abstain from mentioning in this fourth century the pretended catalogue of Pope Damasus,[2] contained in a decree *De explanatione fidei*, which they say must have been passed under this pope, in a council at Rome (between A. D. 366 and 384). This catalogue was equally conformed, for the New Testament, to that of our churches, and was introduced in these terms: "*Nunc vero de scripturis divinis agendum est, quid universalis catholica ecclesia teneat, et quid vitari debeat.*" We regard it as spurious, like that of Innocent; for we now know that all the decretals anterior to Pope Syricus (A. D. 384 to 398) must be ranked among those false decretals which no one, not even in the Roman camp, can any longer undertake to defend.

[1] See the letter of Pope Leo IV. to the English churches (Canon de Libellis, Dist. 20), and that of Nicholas I. to the Gallic bishops (C. si Rom. Dist. 19, A. D. 860).

[2] See Credner, Geschichte des Kanons, iv. p. 187–196.

The Catalogue of Amphilochius.[1]

In fine, as to the catalogue in Greek verse, mentioned among the works of Gregory the theologian,[2] under the title of "Iambi ad Seleucum," which is often attributed to Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium, about A. D. 380, to whom we have already referred, we regard it at least as apocryphal, if not forged. Nothing definite is known of its date, author, or history; it abounds in errors of meter; and there are no means of comparing it with any authentic writing of Amphilochius, to prove its origin from him. Many, again, attribute it to Gregory Nazianzen, as if these iambics presented us a second poetical expression of his views of the canon. Whoever, then, may have been the author of this apocryphal catalogue, it comprehends in "the true canon of the inspired scriptures" all our twenty-seven books of the New Testament; but at the same time notifying us that others erroneously (οὐκ εὖ λέγοντες) reject the Epistle to the Hebrews, and that some do not accept the short epistles of John and Jude, and many more reject the Apocalypse. After naming, then, our twenty-seven books, and no others, he closes with these words:

Οὗτος ἀψευδέστος
Κανὼν ἂν εἴη τῶν θεοπνεύστων Γραφῶν.

"Let this be the true canon of the inspired scriptures."

[1] It is this Amphilochius, who, in order to obtain from the Emperor a decree against the Arians, long refused, came before him without offering any homage to his son Arcadius, seated on a throne by his side. "You are offended, Sire, at my irreverence," he then said to the emperor, "and not without reason; but what will the Father eternal, the King of kings, then think of those who refuse honor to his only Son, and who blaspheme his holy name?" — Sozomen, Lib. vii. chap. 9.

[2] Colon. 1680, tom. ii. p. 193.

SECTION XII.

THE TWO CATALOGUES OF THE FOURTH CENTURY GIVEN BY COUNCILS.

Character of their Testimony.

WHAT we have now been hearing from the lips of all the fathers of the fourth century who have transmitted to us their views of the Scriptures, is precisely what has been repeated by the declarations of the councils of this century, which investigated the claims of the several books to a place in the canon.

Only two councils of this period have expressed their views on the canon: that of Laodicea, and that of Carthage; the one held in Asia Minor, on the river Lycus, in Phrygia, thirty-nine years after the œcumenical council of Nice, A. D. 364; the other in Africa, thirty-three years later, having Bishop Aurelius for its moderator, and, as is said, Augustine of Hippo for assistant moderator, A. D. 397.

We have seen from all the catalogues of this century, beginning with that of the Nicean council, what a remarkable and unconstrained unity of views concerning the canon of the New Testament existed among the fathers. The only and slight exception is found in regard to the Apocalypse, on the part of a few; a harmony uninterrupted, as from the beginning, on the twenty books of the first canon; a harmony, from that time universal, on the five antilegomens of Eusebius, that is, the second canon; a harmony, not less entire, on the Epistle to the Hebrews. We find no more hesitation, real or apparent, excepting in regard to the Apocalypse. And if we say real or apparent, it is because very different causes can at different times produce the one or the other. On the one hand, with some persons, the dispute against the Millenarians was then too recent, and the contest too severe, especially in the East, to allow of an

immediate reception of that book on which they founded their doctrines. And, on the other side, even with many of those churches which were the most firmly convinced of the canonicity of the Apocalypse, this book was too mystical to be publicly read in their popular assemblies. At the same time, while these two causes produced a diversity of language in the church concerning the Apocalypse, this very diversity had now ceased, and all the churches, in this respect, as in every other, had become harmonious, and were presenting to the world but one and the same doctrine.

This we shall find in the decisions of the councils of Laodicea and Carthage. They will but confirm the testi mony of the fathers.

Before hearing them, however, we should distinctly under stand their object. It was evidently, not the announcing of a dogma for the church, but the instituting of a discipline; for their language is constantly that of testimony and not of authority. Neither of them speaks as pretending to determine what books shall thenceforth be regarded by the church as divine, and which as not divine. Their sole object is to regulate the public reading of the scriptures, and therefore to state what was the opinion of cotemporary churches, and what the testimony of antiquity concerning the books authorized to be publicly read; for, says the council of Carthage, "we have received from the fathers that these are the books to be read in the church." Thus it will be noticed that not a word of their language resembles the proud utterances of the council of Trent, deciding for the universal church, as God alone can do, the canonicity of such and such a book, and uttering then its anathema (*post jactum fidei confessionis fundamentum*[1]) against any one who should dare to differ from their opinion on that point: "*Si quis libros* (*istos*) *pro sacris et canonicis non*

[1] Words of the Council of Trent, (Sess. iv.) April 8, 1546, Labbé, Concilia, tom. xiv. p. 746.

susceperit, . . . anathema sit! . . . ." The decree of Carthage, like that of Laodicea, attests, then, that they wished to declare, not what books should be received as divine, but what books, already acknowledged as divine by the church of God, from the traditions of history, should be PUBLICLY READ in the sacred assemblies of Asia Minor and of Northern Africa.

The council of Laodicea says, "In the church there should be read, neither private psalms (that is, composed by uninspired persons), nor uncanonical books (ἀκανόνιστα); but only the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments; and these are all that should be read."[1] . . etc. "It has appeared to us proper," say the council of Carthage, "that, except the canonical scriptures, NOTHING SHOULD BE READ in the church, under the name of divine scriptures; except that the acts of the martyrs[2] may be read on the anniversaries of their deaths."

Two facts characterize the catalogue of Laodicea; and also two that of Carthage:

For the Old Testament, the council of Laodicea entirely excluded the apocryphal books; and for the New Testament, it did not mention the Apocalypse; while in every other respect fully agreeing with the canon of our churches.

For the Old Testament, on the contrary, the council of Carthage admits the apocryphal books; and for the New Testament, it names the Apocalypse; so that in the latter it is in perfect harmony with our canon.

But these two classes of facts fully examined will show an entire accordance, as we shall presently demonstrate. Their contradiction is only in appearance.

The Council of Laodicea.

The council of Laodicea was convoked A. D. 364, to represent the different countries of Asia Minor, and to promote

[1] Cave, Hist. Litt. p. 362. [2] Mansi, iii. p. 891.

ecclesiastical discipline in their churches. Thirty-two bishops were there under their metropolitan Nunechius. This date is furnished us by the ancient code of the canons of the universal church, which early admitted the canons of Laodicea, and which controlled all the churches to the sixth century. Larger than any provincial council, because it was composed of deputies from the whole of Asia Minor, the council of Laodicea was from the beginning an object of very great respect in all the churches; and its decisions were at once regarded by the Latins as well as the Greeks,[1] as making part of "the Ecclesiastical Regulations," imposed on all bishops. This is fully seen in the letter of Pope Leo IV., about A. D. 850, to the clergy of Great Britain.[2] In fact, it is not only by the sixth œcumenical council of Constantinople[3] that the canons of Laodicea were placed in "the code of the universal church," but also by the fourth œcumenical council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451, and by a decree of the emperor Justinian, A. D. 536;[4] so that they had in the churches the authority even of general councils and of the imperial laws which sanctioned them. The clear and conclusive writings of Justel[5] and Le Chassier[6] may be consulted on these facts; as also the learned expositions of Bishop Cosin, in his book on the canon.[7]

Nevertheless, whatever may have been the veneration of the ancient church for the council of Laodicea, we must confidently expect to find the Roman leaders attempting to

[1] *Hoc concilium antiquâ nobilitate celeberrimum*, says Binius, *Græcorum atque Latinorum scriptis celebri memoriæ commendatum fecit.* (Ex Baronio, note i. in Laod. Conc.)

[2] Canon de Libellis, Dist. 20.

[3] Quinisexta Synodus in Trullo (692); its canons sometimes objected to.

[4] Novel. 131.

[5] Præfat. in Codic. Ecclesiæ Univers. — Testimonia præfixa ante Codicem Dion. Exigui.

[6] Opusc. in Consult. de Controversiâ inter Papam Paulum V. et Rempubl. Venetam.

[7] Art. lix.–lxiij.

destroy its authority;[1] because it absolutely excludes from the canon the apocryphal books of the Old Testament canonized twelve hundred years afterward, by the council of Trent. Their arguments on this point have been powerfully contested by Bishop Cosin. They say,

1. That Dionysius the Less omitted this catalogue in his "Universal Code of the Canons."

But Dionysius is well known to have made many other alterations and retrenchments.

2. The Roman code,[2] they say, does not contain it.

But our appeal should be to the Greeks rather than the Latins, to the universal code much more than to the Roman code. For has not the latter in like manner omitted eight canons of the council of Ephesus, the last three of the council of Constantinople, and the last two of the council of Chalcedon?

Cosin also declares that the fraud is betrayed by a remarkable imprudence; for, in removing the catalogue of the scriptures from the 59th canon of Laodicea, they have inadvertently left the preface and title, which distinctly allude to the books enumerated afterward in all the other editions of the council. Those which we receive from Mercator, Merlin, Crab, Surius, Du Tillier, Binius, as also those of Balsamon and Zonaras, all alike contain the catalogue omitted in the Roman code.[3]

[1] It is marked as suspicious, in many editions of the councils, for example, in Harduin. (i. 79.)

[2] "Codex Canonum et Decretorum Ecclesiæ Romanæ."

[3] It must, however, be admitted that the authenticity of the catalogue as an integral part of the 59th canon of Laodicea has been contested more recently, in two opposite directions, by learned men: on the one side Spittler (Saemmtl. Werke, 1776 and 1835, viii. 66), and Bickel on the other (Stud. und Krit. 1830, p. 591); that they have marked its absence from many Greek MSS. of the eleventh century, and from some of the ancient Latin versions; and, in fine, that Mr. Westcott, (Hist. of Canon, Cambridge, 1855,) having consulted the Syriac versions in the Brit. Museum, and not having found it there, thinks that the external proofs are rather against the authenticity of the catalogue. — Pages 500–502.

3. Catharinus, to escape the decree of Laodicea, has recourse, on the contrary, to the supposition that the catalogue was originally more extended; and that, in order to remove the apocryphal books, they made the retrenchment. "*Vehementer suspicor*," he says,[1] "I strongly suspect."

But, by a similar process, any one can add or remove whatever suits his wishes.

4. Finally, Baronius, in his "Annals," is still more daring. He imagines the council of Laodicea to have preceded that of Nice, and the latter to have made a decree on the apocrypha! He hopes also to overthrow the authority of the former by that of the latter, which would, as an œcumenical council, revoke the decisions of a merely provincial council.

But, in the first place, we have already shown[2] how this supposition of a decree of Nice upon the book of Judith is without foundation. In the second place the code of the universal church, in giving the canons of Laodicea, itself assigns to the council the date of A. D. 364. In the third place, all the ancient Greek and Latin collections of the synodal canons have always placed those of Laodicea after those of the council of Antioch; and we know that this was held sixteen years after that of Nice. In fine, the Photinians are condemned in the 7th canon of Laodicea. Now they are not spoken of before A. D. 345; that is, twenty years after the council of Nice.

We give here the fifty-ninth and sixtieth canons of the decree of Laodicea; they are, in fact, the last two of the council, but are numbered 163 and 164 in the Universal Code, which contained 207 before the time of Dionysius the Less.

"Private psalms are not to be read in the church, nor any uncanonical books, but only the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments. These are the books of the Old Testament to be recognized: 1. The Genesis of the

[1] De Script. Canonic.

[2] Canon, chap. i. sec. viii.

world; 2. The Exodus from Egypt; 3. Leviticus; 4. Numbers; 5. Deuteronomy; 6. Joshua; 7. Judges; 8. Ruth; 9. Esther; 10. Four Books of Kings; 11. Two Books of Chronicles; 12. First and Second of Ezra (Ezra and Nehemiah); 13. Book of one hundred and fifty Psalms; 14. Proverbs of Solomon; 15. Ecclesiastes; 16. Song of Songs; 17. Job; 18. Twelve Prophets; 19. Isaiah; 20. Jeremiah and Baruch,[1] Lamentations, and Epistles; 21. Ezekiel; 22. Daniel. The books of the New Testament are, the four Gospels, according to Matthew, Mark, Luke, John; the Acts of the Apostles; the seven catholic epistles, namely, one of James, two of Peter, three of John, one of Jude; fourteen epistles of Paul, one to the Romans, two to the Corinthians, one to the Galatians, one to the Ephesians, one to the Philippians, one to the Colossians, two to the Thessalonians, one to the Hebrews, two to Timothy, one to Titus, one to Philemon."

Why did the bishops in this council omit the Apocalypse, since this is the only imperfection in their catalogue?

Many will attribute this silence to their not having yet restored the Apocalypse to the canon; but this explanation is entirely incompatible with cotemporary facts. And we believe it a much more satisfactory reason to assign, that the fathers of this council, while admitting the canonicity of this sacred book, judged it too symbolical and mystical for public reading in the churches.

In fact, we must not lose sight of the end which the

[1] It must not be imagined that the book of Baruch is here intended, but simply an exegetical manner of indicating more explicitly that which, according to the Jewish reckoning, the twentieth book contained, which we call Jeremiah and his Lamentations. It was nearly in the same terms that Origen already, a hundred years before, designated this same book. (Euseb. Hist. Ecc. Lib. vi. chap. 25.) He says, "Jeremiah with his Epistles and Lamentations (chap. xxx.) forms but one book." Athanasius and Cyril, in their designation of the book of Jeremiah, add, with the Laodicean Council, the indication of the twenty-ninth chapter and of that which relates to Baruch. Besides, we see the council has carefully numbered all of Jeremiah as the twentieth book.

fathers of this council had in view. Occupied with the single question, what books were to be read in the churches, they contented themselves with two declarations. By the first they forbade the reading of any non-canonical book; by the second they ordered the reading of the twenty-two books of the Old Testament, and twenty-six books of the New. But they no where said that they did not consider the twenty-seventh, although they did not name it, as canonical; any more than the church of England says it, when, on the one hand, in her Prayer-Book, (in the sixth of the thirty-nine articles of faith,) she ranks the Apocalypse among the canonical books, and, on the other, in the calendar and the preface to the same liturgy, she does not allow the Apocalypse to be read in public.

Certainly, if the bishops of Laodicea, instead of making a simple decree on the readings in the temple, had pretended to exclude the Apocalypse from the canon, they would have caused a clamor of remonstrance from every quarter, so earnest that the sound of it would have reached our ears. How, indeed, could a council have set itself against the powerful testimony rendered by the earliest martyrs and the most venerable fathers of the church to the Apocalypse? How could they have given this solemn contradiction to the Justin Martyrs, the Irenæuses, the Methodiuses, the Hippolytes, the Melitos, the Alexandrian Clements, the Antiochan Theophiluses, the Origens, and the Tertullians, without causing remonstrances and protestations to be heard in every part and section of the church? Had not Tertullian declared the rejection of this book to stand among "the heresies?"[1]

Now, on the contrary, during all this epoch, you hear only one complaint from any of the illustrious admirers of the Apocalypse. Yet they were flourishing at the time of the council; they were filling the Christian world with their writings. Athanasius was still living; Epiphanius, Basil the

[1] Against Marcion, Lib. iv.

Great, St. Ephraim, all equally attached to the canonicity of this book, were still living;[1] Jerome and Rufinus were then in their full vigor.[2] And, not only has none of these eminent men raised his voice against a decision so contrary to his belief, but we can not find even one writer opposed to the readmission of the Apocalypse, who justifies his views by an appeal to the decree of Laodicea.

But still farther: it was but thirty-three years afterward when the council of Carthage named the Apocalypse in its decree, yet no one spoke of that as contradicting the council of Laodicea, so much respected by the Eastern and Western churches. It is then merely a difference of view concerning the public services of the sanctuary which we find in the action of these two councils; a point on which churches might innocently hold different opinions.

There is, however, another authentic fact which proves that the two councils were considered at that period, as not at all discordant on articles of faith, but as differing only on points of external service in which unity was not required. We allude to the action of the sixth general council of Constantinople;[3] in the seventh century. This great assembly, composed of two hundred and twenty-seven bishops, solemnly confirmed, in its second canon, the council of Laodicea, as well as the letters of Athanasius, Gregory Nazianzen, and Amphilochius, (which exclude the apocryphal books from the scriptures,) but at the same time equally recognized the council of Carthage. This fact appears to us conclusive. We see that, to approve of both these assemblies at the same time, the council saw in the Carthaginian decree relative to reading the scriptures in the church a measure entirely reconcilable with the Laodicean decree. It is therefore evident that both decrees had reference, not to doctrine, but to discipline.

[1] They died twelve, fifteen, and thirty-eight years afterward.
[2] Thirty-three years of age.
[3] Quinisextum, in Trullo, 692.

The Council of Carthage.

All the histories of the council of Carthage show that it took place in the beginning of September, A. D. 397, during the consulship of Cæsarius and Atticus. And yet it ordains, in its forty-seventh canon, that "The bishops shall consult on their resolutions the church beyond sea, as well as their brethren and colleagues Boniface, and other bishops of those countries."

Now this Boniface, forty-third bishop of Rome, did not begin his reign until twenty-one years after the date of this decree. It is then evident, that we have here another instance of those fraudulent interpolations so frequently made by the Roman hierarchy, or the blunder of some compiler who has introduced into the canon the decree of a council held perhaps a century afterward.

Another article of the same council here comes in to confirm this explanation; it is the forty-eighth canon, which ordains in its turn that the bishops of the council "take the advices of their brethren Siricius and Simplicius," bishops of Rome and Milan. Now, between this Siricius referred to in the forty-eighth canon, and this Boniface consulted by order of the forty-seventh canon, there were at least three popes; the first dying A. D. 398, a year after the council; and the other beginning his reign A. D. 418.

Whatever may be the date of this forty-seventh canon, it is to us a monument of the universal thought of the churches of this epoch. In fact, not only does it furnish us the same catalogue of the sacred books which are now universally acknowledged, but it also enumerates them all exactly to the twenty-seventh in the order of our modern bibles. We give it then as found in the edition of the councils by Labbe and Cossart (tom. ii. p. 1177).[1] "Canon 47th. It has pleased the council to decree that, besides the

[1] See also p. 106, Integer Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ Africanæ, Greek and Latin, cap. xxxiv.

canonical scriptures, nothing shall be read in the church under the name of divine scriptures.

"Now these are the canonical scriptures of the Old Testament. . . . .

"And as to the New Testament: four gospels; one book of the Acts of the Apostles; thirteen epistles of Paul; with one of the same to the Hebrews; two of Peter; three of the apostle John; one of Jude, one of James;[1] and one only of the Apocalypse of John."[2] The council adds, "Let this be to make known to our brother and priest Boniface[3] or other bishops of those countries the confirmation of this canon, because we have learned from the fathers that they are the books to be read in the church. At the same time permission is granted to read the sufferings of the martyrs on the anniversaries of their death."

As we shall have hereafter to resume the consideration of the Carthaginian catalogue in reference to the apocryphal books, it would but embarrass us to dwell farther on it now. Only we would remark, before passing from it, that if this catalogue seems to differ from that of Laodicea on a fact and a name, the disagreement is totally external and in appearance. As to the fact, the council decides that the ecclesiastical books shall be read in worship, the reading of which had already been frequently permitted by the ancients, but which Laodicea thought it better no longer to permit. And as to the name, it is wrong to employ the word canonical as the

1 Kirchhofer (p. 12) and Wordsworth (append. p. 33), professing to follow Mansi's edition (tom. iii. p. 891), have omitted the Ep. of James. But the Greek code of the canons of the African church (chap. 34) says, Ἰακώβου ἀποστόλου μία. Also the code of Camb. Univ. library, EE. iv. 29, (Westcott, Gen. Survey of the Canon, 185). Kirchhofer gives this canon twice in his collection, (p. 13, according to Bruns. and p. 503, after Gerhard Von Mæstricht, Brem. 1772). The Epistle of James is in the one, and wanting in the other.

2 An old manuscript (vetustus codex), says Labbe, (Concil. ii. p. 1177); contains these words (*sic habet*): "that to confirm this canon the transmarine church be consulted."

3 Other editions, as that of Binius, say, *et consacerdoti nostro.*

title of these books in a broader sense than it had had for four centuries; applying it in the sense of *libri regulares*, or books adapted to be the rule of life. Such a use of this word, says Cosin, was not made until after the fourth century, and then rarely. We shall have to show hereafter the thought of the council in their use of this term, by the fact that Augustine, present (they say) in this assembly, never ceased to establish an essential difference between the divine scriptures and the canonical books, and that never does he appeal on this question to the decisions of Carthage, as if this council had settled it.

SECTION XIII.

RECAPITULATION OF ALL THE TESTIMONIES OF THE FOURTH CENTURY.

We are now enabled to see that the voice of the universal church, from the times of the apostles always unanimous in regard to the first canon, already unanimous also from the days of the council of Nice in regard to the second, has ended by pronouncing definitely on the second-first, in the course of the fourth century. The temporary and later hesitations of the Western church in regard to the Epistle to the Hebrews had already almost entirely ceased, from the end of the century; and the temporary and late hesitations of the Eastern church in regard to the Apocalypse also soon ceased, so that the canon was thenceforward universally and for ever recognized in all the Christian churches.

SECTION XIV.

COMMON PREJUDICES WHICH THE FIRST REVIEW OF THESE FACTS SHOULD DISSIPATE.

It may be profitable to review these facts, and notice here some of the inexact notions and unfounded fears which too often find currency among us. The believer must guard against the confused echoes of history, which, by being often repeated, come to gain a usurped credit, and assume the dangerous appearance of a historic reality. Thus arise prejudices of long endurance, enfeeblement of principles, hurtful doubts. Let a sciolist with a pretentious air spread among some churches hazardous assertions and inaccurate declarations, and the unwary are sure to be entrapped; it seems to them that such or such a scholar, in his lofty retreat, possesses irrefragable facts, unanswerable discoveries against this or that scripture declaration; they are persuaded that no one dares to confront him face to face, and that prudence requires silence; whilst, on the contrary, if you approach to study the matter closely, you find all these phantoms vanish, and these difficulties disappear. This has been witnessed now for two centuries, in regard to the variations. Would you not have imagined, a hundred years ago, that critical science, according to its own pretensions, had irresistible facts against the scriptures, and that their authority was about to be entirely overthrown? And what has come to pass then? It is that, in marching straight up to these facts, in passing thus from half-science to a complete science, we have soon seen all the pretensions of the adversaries vanish in smoke; so that their efforts to overthrow our faith on that side, have in the end only served to confirm it. So will it be with the canon.

Dr. Thiersch says,[1] "We do not hesitate to maintain, without the fear of appearing to be presumptuous, that there is not in all the range of historical research a field in which a greater mass of prejudices and misconceptions has found entrance, than in this; forming a system which even now exerts a tyrannical influence over men of some eminence."

Some of these false notions and injurious prejudices we will now examine.

1. Many speak of the sacred collection as if it had been a matter of uncertainty to Christian people for three centuries, and as if the books of the New Testament had not been decidedly recognized as divine before the end of the fourth century; whereas it is, on the contrary, a constant fact that the first canon was never and no where an object of uncertainty for the churches of God, but that all the writings which compose it, that is to say, the eight ninths of the New Testament, have been, from their first appearing and during all the succeeding ages, universally recognized as divine by all the Christian churches.

2. Many persons speak of five antilegomens, or of the five brief later epistles, which we denominate the second canon, and which form only the thirty-sixth part of the New Testament, as if they had not been recognized from the apostolical times. This is also a misapprehension. It is true, they were not universally acknowledged (the cause of which we will show); but they were acknowledged from the beginning by the great number of the churches (τοῖς πολλοῖς) and by the largest number (τοῖς πλείστοις) of ecclesiastical writers.

3. They also speak of the second-first canon as if the two books composing it had not been universally recognized as canonical until a late period; whereas, on the contrary, they began by being universally acknowledged in both the East and the West; and it was only later, at the beginning of the third century, and simply from considerations of inter-

[1] "Essay on the Canon." "Versuch zur Verstellung des historischen Standpunkts für die Critik der Neu-Testamentlichen Schriften."

nal criticism, (never from testimony,) that one of these books, always regarded in the East as divine, was contested for a time in the West, and the other of these books, always regarded as divine in the West, was for a time disputed in the East.

4. Many speak of this hesitation of a small portion of the churches on the subject of the antilegomens as having been prolonged into the fourth century. This is, however, an error; for we have found by all the catalogues of the fourth century, that this disagreement ceased as soon as the churches were assembled in the first universal council.

5. Many, too, represent the hesitation of a part of the primitive churches in regard to the second canon, as a fact very grievous to our religious feelings. This, too, is a great mistake. We shall show, on the contrary, that, far from disturbing our faith, this fact rather tends to confirm it, since it attests to us clearly, on the one hand, the firmness, the holy jealousy, and the constant vigilance of the primitive Christians, in regard to the canon; and, on the other, the entire freedom with which they examined its claims, studied its peculiar features, and even in some cases contested its legitimacy. All these facts prove to us, then, with great force, that if, notwithstanding this continual jealousy of the primitive churches, and with this perfect liberty granted them, they always manifested such entire unanimity in receiving the twenty books of the first canon, it was not blindly, not without examination, not to obey human authority; it was, on the contrary, only from having had before their eyes solid reasons, manifest and thoroughly convincing, which forced them to come to the same conclusion. That view alone can explain an agreement so full, so prompt, so universal among men so vigilant, so jealous, and so free.

Thus, then, these very doubts, entertained for a time by a minority of the churches in regard to the five later epistles, doubly aid our faith; since, on the one hand, the existence of these doubts assures us that, in receiving universally the

first twenty books of the New Testament, these churches had not been able to discover the least cause of hesitation in regard to them; and, on the other, the universal cessation of these very doubts equally attests that they must have felt themselves constrained by the most powerful reasons, when they all finally received, without exception, the second canon, as in the beginning they had received the first.

6. Many, again, to diminish the authority of the scriptures, or to exalt that of tradition, have insisted that the church, during her first and most glorious years, lived long without a written word, having only the spoken word and tradition. That, too, is a mistake. The primitive church never assembled without making the reading of the Old Testament the most prominent part of her service; for she always believed that these "holy scriptures are able to make the man of God wise unto salvation," "furnished unto all good works," "through faith which is in Christ Jesus." After the example of Jesus and his apostles, she has always nourished herself on the written word; and by it constantly fortified her faith and hope. These scriptures have never ceased to be a lamp to her feet. "Search them," Jesus says, "for they are they which testify of me."

7. Many, too, speak of the canon as if its definitive form had been fixed by the councils, — the act of the church pronouncing decrees. This, too, is a mistake; nothing indeed is more contrary to the real facts; and this we must show now, although we must resume this point when we come to treat of the veritable foundation of our faith in the canon of the scriptures.

No human authority interfered in this matter. It was the pure and simple product of the conscience, of research, of freedom. The churches of God, enlightened by the mutual testimony of their members, judged in this case only by their own wisdom, under the secret and powerful direction of that Providence which will always watch over the written word. The universal reception of the first canon preceded all the

councils; and these when they came together were occupied with every other question but that of the canon. We shall yet show with more precision, that the general councils never passed a decree on this subject for fourteen centuries; as we have already shown that even the two provincial councils of Laodicea and Carthage, too often cited, can no more be regarded as authority on the question before us.

Lardner[1] has demonstrated, by long quotations from the fathers, that the canon of the New Testament has in no degree been formed by human authority. Basnage[2] has given three chapters of his church history to this point. John Le Clerc[3] has said, "There has been no need of a council of grammarians, to declare magisterially which are the works of Cicero or of Virgil. So, too, the authenticity of the Gospels was established, and has continued without any decree of the rulers of the church. We may say the same of the apostolical epistles, which owe all their authority, not to the decisions of any ecclesiastical assembly, but to the concordant testimony of all Christians, and to the very character of their contents." Augustine, too, thirteen centuries before Le Clerc, said, "We know the writings of the apostles as we know those of Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Varro, and others; and as we know the writings of different ecclesiastical authors, because they have the testimony of their cotemporaries and of the men who lived immediately after them."

Let us content ourselves with remarking here that the ancient fathers, in their judgments on the canon, appealed only to the free and uninterrupted testimony of the churches, at the same time making an attentive examination of the books proposed for their acceptance. When they give us a

[1] Supplement, 50–52; 2d part, tom. i.; edit. 8, tom. vi. pp. 325, 381; tom. ii. pp. 325, 496, 529, 576; tom. viii. pp. 102, 225, 268; tom. x. pp. 193, 207, 208.

[2] Lib. viii. chap. v. vi. vii.

[3] In the years 29 and 100 of his Hist. Eccl.

catalogue, it is never as the fruit of their discoveries, nor as the decisions of any authority whatever; they report to us only the thoughts of the preceding ages; the free testimony of the primitive churches; that which they have received from their predecessors, by a transmission continued from the days of the apostles.

When Origen, born 142 years before the council of Nice, gives us his catalogue of the canonical Scriptures (*τῶν ἐνδιαθήκων γραφῶν*), he appeals to no decisions of any council, but merely to the ancient men of the church (*οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες*) and to tradition (*ὡς ἐν παραδόσει μαθών*). It is Eusebius who has preserved his words to us, and who adds, in reporting his testimony on the four Gospels: "Origen preserves tradition and the ecclesiastical canon;[1] and he attests that there are but four Gospels, alone received without any contradiction by all the church of God which is under the heavens."

Also Eusebius himself, when giving his opinion on the collection of books in the New Testament and on the distinction between the books universally received and those which are contested, refers neither to any authority nor council, and declares that he receives the canon from ecclesiastical tradition (*κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν παράδοσιν*).[2]

Thus Athanasius, born in 296, in giving his canon completely conformed to ours, attributes it "to the transmission to the fathers by those who were eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word from the beginning;"[3] but he refers to no council, and gives us only what he calls books recognized as authoritative, transmitted and received as divine.

None of the authors, even of the centuries which followed, to the fourth, fifth, or sixth, ever appeals on this point to the decisions of any council. Thus, when Cyril, patriarch of Jerusalem, born twenty years after Athanasius, gives us his catalogue of the theopneustic books (*αἱ θεόπνευστοι Γραφαί*),

[1] Hist. Eccl. vi. 25. [2] Hist. Eccl. iii. 25.
[3] Festal Epistle, xxxix.

he refers to no council, and appeals only "to the apostles and ancient bishops who presided over the churches, and who have transmitted them to us."[1] Thus, when Augustine, at the end of the same century, or rather at the beginning of the fifth, wrote his directions to certain persons who had consulted him "on the books really canonical," he appealed only to the testimony of the different churches of Christendom, and referred to no council.[2] Thus when Rufinus, priest in Aquileia toward the year A. D. 340, gives us in his turn a catalogue (also exactly conformed to ours), he attributes it "only to the tradition of the ancients, who had transmitted them to the churches of Christ as divinely inspired;" and he declares that he gives it as he found it in the monuments of the fathers.[3]

And when Cassiodorus, Roman consul in the sixth century, gives us three catalogues of the New Testament (one of Jerome, one of Augustine, and one of an ancient version), he likewise makes no reference to any decree or any council.[4] Let us then hear no more about councils fixing authoritatively the canon of the Scriptures. This canon is undoubtedly fixed; but not by any authority of councils. God determined that Christians and churches, enlightened by the testimony of Christian generations, should form their own convictions on this subject, in complete freedom of judgment, in order that the authenticity of the sacred books might thereby be made the more manifest.

We shall hereafter examine this important fact from another point of view; but it should suffice us here to learn from these testimonies how erroneous and contrary

1 Catech. iv. 33.

2 De Doct. Christ. Lib. ii. vol. iii. part i. p. 47. Paris, 1836. (He began this book in 397, and finished it in 407.) See also Lardner, tom. x. p. 207.

3 In Symbol. Apost. p. 26. "Quæ secundum majorum traditionem per ipsum Spiritum Sanctum inspirata creduntur et ecclesiis Christi tradita, competens videatur in hoc loco evidenti numero sicut ex Patrum monumentis accepimus designare."

4 Lardner, tom. xi. p. 303; Cassiod. De Instit. Divin. Litterar. cap. xi.

to facts is the pretension of seeking the origin or the determination of the canon in any ecclesiastical decree.

SECTION XV.

CONCLUSION FROM ALL THESE TESTIMONIES OF THE FIRST FOUR CENTURIES.

From this long review, and from the united testimony of all these fourteen catalogues, the inheritance of four centuries, the first to the death of John, toward the end of the first century; the second to the death of Irenæus and of Clement of Alexandria, toward the end of the second century; the next to the approaches of the ruin of Roman paganism, toward the end of the third century; and the eleven others in the course of the fourth century, from the days of Eusebius to the death of Gregory Nazianzen, or even to the council of Carthage; — from these fourteen catalogues, we say, arise three cardinal facts and three important questions.

First, from this permanent and universal unanimity of the churches in maintaining in all parts of the world the twenty books of the first canon, — from this striking and permanent fact, which no one disputes, arises this question: On what foundation rests this unanimity, so constant, free, astonishing, and universal? How was it formed?

The reply to this will form the subject of our second chapter; it will confirm our confidence in the complete authenticity of the first canon; it will increase our respect for the Holy Scriptures, and our regard for their authority.

From this first fact arises another; that, beside the twenty books of the first canon, the two epistles which form our second-first canon participated from the beginning, and to the middle of the third century, in this universal recognition. Hence this second question: Whence arose, after this epoch, the objections in regard to these two Scriptures? What was

their weight? and how was the authenticity of the second-first canon at length established in the presence of this later and temporary opposition?

The answer to this second question will be the subject of our third chapter.

Finally, from the same testimonies springs a third fact, equally important; it is, that five short epistles, constituting the second canon, and containing in themselves only the thirty-sixth part of the New Testament, recognized by the greater portion of the churches, were nevertheless not acknowledged by some. This continued to the time of the council of Nice, twenty-five years after the third century. Hence arises another question, the third and last: How is it possible that the antilegomens, if authentic, were not universally received from the time of the apostles' death? How came they to be acknowledged afterward? and how does this fact of the partial resistance they met consist with the perfect certainty we entertain of their authenticity, and that of the other books of the canon?

The reply to the several phases of this question will be the subject of our fourth chapter.

CHAPTER SECOND.

OF THE FIRST CANON.

We have already showed in our first chapter, — and it will be well to bear it in mind throughout the course of this, — that almost all our arguments in favor of the first canon apply equally, so far as the first two centuries of the church are concerned, to the two books of the second-first canon; and that Eusebius for this reason placed them in the rank of the homologomens. We shall commence with the evidence, which is so abundant, of the primitive, constant, and universal unanimity of the churches in regard to these twenty books.

SECTION I.

THE PERFECT AND CONSTANT UNANIMITY OF THE CHURCHES.

The simple review which we have made in our first chapter of all the authentic catalogues furnished by the first ages of the church, must powerfully affect every attentive reader.

At least fourteen catalogues have been given to us by the three centuries immediately succeeding the age of the apostles, — for we might add the two anonymous catalogues attributed to Amphilochius and Muratori.[1] They are the unanimous testimony of the most learned and venerable men

[1] See Canon, chap. i. sec. vii. x. xi.; chap. ii. sec. v. vi.

of the East and the West. And this testimony, too, is not only on their part a public attestation of their personal conviction: it is a public declaration of the common conviction; it is their unanimous recognition of a great historical fact, — a fact uncontested and incontestable: the agreement of all the churches of the world as to the first canon. "Such is," they say, "the voice of the ages which have gone before us, the voice of the churches from one end of the earth to the other, since the times of the apostles; a voice ever definite, clear, and unhesitating. We have all listened to all the traditions of ancient times, to observe if there would reach us, from the midst of the ancient churches, one solitary discordant cry, — and we have heard nothing of the kind. We have looked into the depths of times past to see if we could discover any thing which would authorize the slightest doubt, and we have seen in all the vast horizon not even the smallest cloud of contradiction, — not a cloud even as large as the hand of a man."

And what witnesses of the opinion of their period: Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Cyril, Gregory Nazianzen, Jerome, Epiphanius, Augustine! Could there be any better situated, more competent, more credible? Better situated? They occupied the highest positions, they were scattered over all the known world and at great distances from each other; — these on the banks of the Euphrates or the Nile, of the Save or the Rhone; those on the borders of the African Syrtes or of the Euxine Sea. More worthy of faith? They were almost all confessors or martyrs; almost all so penetrated with a love for the Scriptures that they defended them with their lives; all so sincere and free in their researches that they report to us without reserve all they know about it, and that they are prompt to inform us that by the side of the homologomens are five later short epistles which, although received by the majority, are not acknowledged by all; whilst they declare that they have never heard in any church in the world the least opposition to the other

twenty books. More competent, or better informed? There never were any such. They are all learned men; all have searched the Scriptures; all have traveled on account of the Word of God, in the East and the West; they have seen Rome and Alexandria, Constantinople and Jerusalem; they have met each other in councils; and they have all, concerning Christian antiquities, an amount of knowledge before which our modern scholars are but children. What a witness, for instance, at the opening of the fourth century is Eusebius, who, in order to write, in A. D. 324, his history of the beginnings of Christianity, put himself in possession of all ancient literature; examined thoroughly the libraries gathered in Cæsarea by Pamphilus, and in Jerusalem by Alexander; read all the now lost works of Aristion, Quadratus, Aristides, Hegesippus, Papias, Tatian, Melito, — known to our modern scholars only through him! And what a witness, yet a century earlier than Eusebius, is Origen, that "scholar with entrails of brass," as he has been called, who, from the close of the second century, consecrated all the resources of his genius to the study of the Scriptures, and who himself was an immediate disciple of that Clement of Alexandria who was born only forty years after the death of the Apostle John!

We may, then, from this imposing testimony, deduce the four following conclusions: —

1. When so large a number of men, so learned, so sincere and so independent, inform us from all quarters of the earth, that, after having diligently studied all the history of the churches of God from the days of the apostles, they have not been able to find among them, up to the beginning of the third century, anything but the most perfect unanimity in regard to all the books of the first canon, then, surely, we must acknowledge that all antiquity no where presents us a single historical fact so superabundantly demonstrated as this constant unanimity of the churches.

2. This very unanimity is so perfect that it excludes all

possibility that any one of these homologomens could have obtained it, if it had not been received at first by the churches while the apostles were living, and with their sanction.

3. It would likewise have been absolutely impossible that, after the death of the apostles, so many thousands of churches, then spread over all the earth, could immediately have consented to receive any additional book into their canon, even though that book had already been received by a great part of them with the best marks of its apostolical authenticity, — as was afterward the case with the antilegomens. One such book could never have been accepted by so many thousand churches in Egypt, in Asia Minor, in Mesopotamia, in Greece, in Spain, in Africa, in Italy and in Gaul, without having to pass through a long period of scruples, oppositions, and hesitations, the noise of which would have reached the ears of such men as Origen, Cyril, Athanasius, and Eusebius.

4. If such a posthumous acceptance by all the churches was at length consummated in regard to the antilegomens, and if it finally silenced all opposition, it is surely an extraordinary fact highly improbable before the event, and humanly inexplicable except by the abundance of the evidences of legitimacy which these later books were found to possess.

But if, shortly after the death of the apostles, any one had attempted to add to the primitive canon of the twenty-two homologomens, transmitted to all the cotemporary churches by the apostles themselves, any new work, even if it had the most satisfactory titles of authenticity, and though accepted by a majority of the existing churches, it is impossible to admit that this additional book could have been immediately accepted by all the churches to the very ends of the earth. And not only is this true; but if we should go still farther, and even imagine such a book, after the death of the apostles, to have been accepted by *churches* the most independent of each other without resistance or objection, without discussion or hesitation, — yea, without leaving one

trace of any resistance or objection, yet it is utterly impossible to believe that this new book would have been immediately and universally placed in the *collection* of the primitive apostolical books, and in the same rank with them.

And yet this must be admitted if the primitive introduction of the twenty-two homologomens was not anterior to the deaths of the apostles, and accomplished during their ministry.

It is, then, well established, by the force of historical testimony, that none of the homologomens was introduced into the sacred collection after the death of the apostles.

SECTION II.

THE NEW TESTAMENT IN ITS TWENTY-TWO HOMOLOGOMENOUS BOOKS INCOMPARABLY SUPERIOR TO ALL THE BOOKS OF ANTIQUITY, IN THE EVIDENCE OF ITS AUTHENTICITY.

SUSTAINED, then, by the testimony of this majestic unanimity, we may boldly affirm that, in all the field of ancient literature, there is not a single book comparable — even remotely — to our first canon, as to the perfect certainty of its authenticity. History will never present any thing like it in point of literary legitimacy; and we may fearlessly challenge the production of any one book among all those that are now most fully acknowledged by learned men to be the genuine productions of antiquity, which can show one tenth of the scientific vouchers that sustain the claims of our first canon. Michaelis[1] has remarked: "The testimonial proof of its legitimacy is infinitely superior, in many particulars, to all that ancient literature can present us even for the works most abundantly attested."

This enormous inequality may be seen in at least ten or eleven of its different features.

[1] Introd. to the New Test. vol. i. p. 24, etc.

Profane works, even the most eminent, were directed only to individuals, by isolated authors; or rather, most frequently, to no one; whereas the books of the New Testament were written by the apostles to the churches of their own day; that is, by great public personages to great associations of men who knew them, who were known by them, who were scattered over the earth, permanent, free, bound to them and each other by ties the most intimate and sacred. First and potent guaranty of the authenticity peculiar to the Scriptures of the New Testament.

The books of antiquity, even the most authentic and celebrated, however cordially welcomed by their cotemporary readers, have never excited an interest even remotely comparable to that felt by the primitive Christians in their Scriptures. What solicitude had the readers of the former, after all, about being preserved from error in regard to the legitimacy of the books? Their indifference on this point is exhibited and measured by the lightness of their researches in respect to it. Suppose they should mistake the author of a book, and attribute to Tacitus or Pliny, Plutarch or Cicero the work of another, what would be the injury? All their efforts to be informed on the point of authorship accordingly amounted to nothing more than brief investigations. But how different it was with the primitive Christians, to whom were transmitted, in the name of the apostles, the books in which these holy men had spoken as they were moved by the Holy Ghost! It was a vital question to determine, whether such an epistle or such a gospel was indeed the work of those apostles and prophets on whom the church of the living God is built as its foundation, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone. (Eph. ii. 20.) For these living oracles was not every one of them ready to offer his life? And if so, was not the question of the origin of these books a matter of supreme moment with them? Their Christianity, their faith, their salvation, were all involved in it. A second and po-

tent guaranty, which belongs exclusively to our sacred books.

When the writings of antiquity were issued, their cotemporary readers were generally neither eye-witnesses nor competent judges of the facts which they there found reported; whereas, on the contrary, our sacred books made their appeals to facts which the entire church and every believer in the church could confirm by his own eyes. They quote living witnesses, actors in the scenes, ministers known for thirty years by all cotemporary Christians, miracles performed in their own day, congregations who had witnesses among themselves, prophecies, tongues, healings, which continued through all the lives of the apostles,[1] and during the generation that succeeded them, that is, to the commencement of the second century. A third guaranty, which made a mistake in regard to the canon in the primitive churches impossible.

The writings of the ancient literature now extant were published without the authorization of any body of men, and without any security for their transmission; whereas, on the contrary, the books of the New Testament had for these, on the one hand, the churches with their bishops, and on the other, the college of the apostles whose protracted lives extended to the end of the first century. Paul alone had carried the gospel from Arabia to Jerusalem, from Jerusalem to Illyricum, and thence to Italy, and perhaps farther west, (Rom. xv. 19, 21,) charged as he was with the care of all the churches (2 Cor. xi. 28); Peter was thirty years at the head of the evangelization of the Jews, as Paul of the Gentiles (Gal. ii. 8, 9); and John was, till the opening of the second century, at the head of the churches of Asia. Fourth guaranty of authenticity, which not even the least-contested of profane books have ever offered.

The most celebrated works of the ancient world were read and reread, without doubt, eagerly, by their cotemporaries; but to make way afterward for other writings no less es-

[1] See Gal. iii. 2; Acts xix. 2; 1 Cor. xiv. 27.

teemed, and then to be neglected for ages. But how totally different it was with the holy scriptures of the New Testament! They were constantly read; incessantly copied for personal use; continually studied; the most barbarous people learned to read, merely that they might the better comprehend them; they were meditated night and day (Ps. i. 1-3), from church to church, from generation to generation; for this was then, always, as in the days of David, the mark of the righteous man, who constantly made them the light of his feet and the lamp of his path. Fifth guaranty of an authenticity belonging exclusively to our canon.

The writings of the ancients, however eminent, might, at the end of a few years, be lost and perish, without exciting any regret; and it is thus that so great a number of the finest works of antiquity have for ever disappeared; and among them even those which were at first preserved with the greatest care: the Hortensius of Cicero; almost all of Varro; even the writings of Menander, which were generally known by heart; those of Ennius and Pacuvius; three fourths of Titus Livy; the great History of Sallust; the greater part of Tacitus; the books of the elder Pliny on the German war; the latter part of the Fasti of Ovid; sixty books of the Roman history of Dion Cassius; twenty-five books of the historical library of Diodorus Siculus; and almost the whole of Polybius. Whatever may have been the regard of antiquity for these admirable books, still they have perished. But it could not be so with our sacred books; for, besides the desire of every Christian to possess them, they were preserved for public worship in the numberless oratories scattered over the earth; and every true minister of Jesus Christ, history shows us, would sooner yield his life than his Bible. Sixth guaranty of authenticity, which pertains exclusively to the books of the canon.

While the greater part of even the masterpieces of antiquity were translated into different languages only long after their production, the books of the New Testament were

translated into all the languages of the East even in the first century: first, in Syriac, then in Arabic, Coptic, Sahidic, Armenian, Persian, later in Ethiopian; and also in the Western tongues: in Latin, in Gothic, Sclavonic, Gallo-Celtic, Anglo-Saxon. We have already spoken of the Peshito, and of its high antiquity.[1] A Latin version was made from the earliest days of Christianity; it is believed that the Vetus Itala, which was used before the days of Jerome, was composed before the end of the first century; and we find

[1] *Note by the Translator.* — The Nestorians inhabiting the Koordish mountains and the country lying around the lake of Oroomiah have, from the early ages of Christianity, remained a separate and independent church. They speak a modern dialect of the old Syriac tongue, which was that used by our Saviour. One of the earliest translations of the New Testament was made in that language. It is called the Peshito. Several copies of it, dating back to A. D. 1200, are still carefully preserved by the Nestorians.

The Peshito version is generally admitted to have been made early in the second century. Hence it omits the Apocalypse, 2d Peter, 2d and 3d John.

A copy of this venerable work is now in the library of the A. B. C. F. M., in Boston. Dr. Justin Perkins thus relates the account of its transfer to this country: "This copy was presented to Dr. Grant by Mar Shimon when that heroic missionary-traveller first visited the patriarch, — the first Western man whom he had ever seen; it may be, the first who has penetrated the central portion of Koordistan since the days of Xenophon. These rare copies were kept by the Nestorians, wrapped in a large number of cloth envelopes and hidden away in secret places in their ancient churches, to save them from the ravages of the Mohammedans. The word of the Lord was *precious* in those days. The patriarch was so much pleased with his missionary visitor that he presented to him this his choicest treasure. This copy has a questionable label, giving its date as A. D. 1200. The antiquarians at Oxford, to whom I showed it, thought it must be much older. I have seen no parchment copy among the Nestorians of a date later than the commencement of the thirteenth century.

"This copy contains the books usually found in the Peshito version, which correspond minutely with our canon, except that Revelation, 2d Peter, 2d and 3d John are wanting. This circumstance confirms the genuineness of the copy, as the Peshito, being one of the earliest — perhaps the earliest — translation made, the books latest written had perhaps not then been incorporated into the canon.

"This volume is beautifully written in the ancient Syriac language, in the Estrangelo character. The parchment is deer-skin, the deer being still an inhabitant of Koordistan."

Tertullian quoting it, toward the end of the second century. This is then a seventh guaranty of authenticity belonging only to the sacred canon.

The works of ancient literature have not, like the books of the New Testament, provoked controversies at their very appearing, the noise of which, still reaching us, establishes indirectly, and so much the more forcibly, their authenticity. The New Testament, on the contrary, by the very attacks of its first adversaries, proves the anterior existence of its canons, the apostolicity of its authors, and the faith which the primitive Christians placed in it; so that the first unbelievers and heretics attest to us with irresistible force, by their very hostility, the apostolical authenticity of our sacred books. In the very act of combating their doctrines they recognized their authors, and testified unwittingly to all coming ages that, before them, these books were already the object of the respect of the whole Christian church, and the code of its faith. They contested their teachings, not their authenticity; rejected them as erroneous, never as spurious; while spitefully contradicting, they still regarded them as the works of the apostles whose names they bear.

We shall treat this point at greater length hereafter, but must refer to it in this connection; for this striking testimony of enemies, being less expected, is perhaps weightier than that of all the orthodox fathers. This is an eighth guaranty of authenticity, which has no equivalent in the case of any books of ancient literature.

The books of the ancients — even the most distinguished — are comparatively little quoted by the authors of subsequent ages; it is totally otherwise with our holy Scriptures. Cited, explained, interpreted, taught by an uninterrupted succession of ecclesiastical writers, they might, if we had lost them, be entirely recomposed, as Lardner has affirmed, from the authors who have quoted them. The whole succession of the fathers is employed in reproducing them. We have already spoken of the prodigious labors of Origen on all the

Scriptures. Irenæus, before him, in Gaul, in the second century, cited abundantly all our homologomenous books. At the same time Clement was quoting them in Egypt; and as to Tertullian, in Africa, born about the middle of the second century, he so abundantly quotes by name all the sacred books of the first canon and of the second-first canon, that, in the words of Lardner,[1] "if one should gather the passages of the New Testament introduced into his writings, it would make a collection more extensive than that of all the quotations from Cicero made by all known writers for two thousand years." This is then, for the ninth time, a special guaranty that the New Testament is authentic.

In the mean time there is a tenth feature which alone would establish an immense distance between the scriptures of the New Testament and the other books of ancient literature: it is, that the latter, however abundantly they may have been read, were read by individuals detached from one another; and they thus presented no collective guaranty of their legitimacy; whilst our Scriptures were read, from the days of the apostles, by permanent societies which were organized for this very purpose; read without interruption, from Sunday to Sunday, and from day to day; read in every country then known; read even so abundantly that many men knew them by heart; read in every assembly of worshipers from the days of the apostles, as they are now still read, and as they will continue to be read in every living church until the day when the Lord shall descend from heaven. This tenth guaranty, perhaps more powerful than all the others, must be more fully considered hereafter.

Finally, one last testimony which powerfully sustains the claims of the New Testament, but which is wanting to all the other monuments of classical antiquity, is, that the latter, beside their mere readers, had no continuous order of men seriously and jealously engaged in confirming and controlling

[1] Vol. ii. pp. 250–287.

their titles, with a holy severity, in order to prevent the admission of any doubtful books, and to exclude any book until its authenticity could be positively ascertained; while, on the contrary, for the New Testament, we can trace the uninterrupted succession of such examiners from the very days of the apostles.

If we study the history of the churches minutely, we shall see, from the beginning, twenty-two books in their hands, received during the lives of the apostles, without the whisper of a contradiction in regard to any of them for two centuries; but at the same time we shall hear them speak of five brief letters written to some persons or some churches, and which, received by the greater part (πλείστοις), yet did not meet the same reception by the churches situated at a great distance, which for a time hesitated to receive them. This fact shows at once that there was a conscientious and untrammeled caution exercised by individual churches in forming the canon for themselves. And this want of unanimity in regard to one thirty-sixth portion of the canon gives the more weight to the unanimous assent of the Christian world to the other portions of the New Testament. Thiersch,[1] in his valuable work on the canon, remarks: "At the close of the first century, the churches, thenceforward left to themselves, and more jealous than ever of their sacred deposit, manifested themselves fearful of innovations, controlled by a conservative spirit, and disposed to keep their collection as for ever completed, until it was abundantly proved to them that this or that later epistle was, as commended to them by a great number of churches, apostolic." Thus, unwilling themselves to decide upon its authenticity, they refused, notwithstanding the advice of the majority, to admit it into the sacred canon; and, without rejecting it, contented themselves with declaring that, not having received it at the beginning of their existence as a church, they would wait until sufficient proofs of

[1] Chap. IV. Versuch zur Wiederherstellung des hist. Standpuncts für die Kritik der N. T. Schriften. 1845.

its authenticity should be presented. It is thus that, on the one hand, their admirable firmness in regard to the first canon, and on the other their holy vigilance and jealousy in regard to the second, furnish the same testimony, and serve equally to confirm our faith.

If there had been no resistance on the part of any of the churches to the later epistles, we might have suspected a too ready compliance on their part, and too much carelessness in accepting doubtful books and in the transmission of the canon. But, on the contrary, this control, exercised during two centuries by a certain number among them over the five epistles, this holy reluctance to receive them, united to their fear of rejecting them; this disposition, at once prudent and respectful, at once unwilling for a time either to abandon or adopt them; this long and religious reserve, sufficiently show with what wisdom they proceeded, with what freedom they examined, with what mature judgment they finally decided the question.

It is thus that all these remarkable facts combine to furnish a new force to the testimony of their complete unanimity in regard to the first canon.

What we have now said, therefore, may entirely answer all demands for proof to establish our position, and permit us confidently to maintain that this unanimity of the churches throughout the entire world, joined to all the peculiar circumstances which accompanied them, gives to the first canon, or rather the twenty-two homologomens, a certainty which can be equaled by nothing in the entire field of literature.

And yet, however complete a guaranty this may furnish us, it will be made still more complete by the study we are about to make of the causes of so marvelous an agreement. To what human causes must we attribute this grand historical phenomenon? This is the point we are now about to examine; and the research will develop new sources of proof for the authenticity of our canon.

We shall first examine three other historical facts, which,

while characterizing the primitive church, explain to us how this astonishing unanimity of all the people of God in regard to the first canon was so promptly secured.

SECTION III.

THREE CAUSES PARTICULARLY HAVE PROVIDENTIALLY SECURED THIS UNANIMITY.

The long Career of the Apostles.

THE first fact, which characterizes and controls the history of the primitive church, and which was necessary to secure this unanimity, is the lengthened duration of the lives of the apostles, notwithstanding their trials and the innumerable perils of their ministry. It becomes the more remarkable when we remember their position in the world: "as sheep in the midst of wolves;" as they themselves said, "delivered unto death for Jesus' sake; persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed; accounted as sheep for the slaughter," they were almost all preserved by the mighty providence of God for a ministry of thirty, fifty, and sixty years.

It has been remarked that whenever God purposed to produce some important and durable reformation in the church, he has always taken care to give a long career to the men destined to accomplish it; because he wished to furnish them all the time needed for consummating and confirming it.

When he had driven man out of paradise, he gave each of the early patriarchs nearly nine centuries of life, to put them in a condition for preserving among their children's children to the twentieth generation the knowledge of their fall and of the promise. The son of Enoch, who had lived with Adam nearly two hundred and fifty years, might live

also nearly six centuries with Noah, who was to be for the new world a preacher "of the righteousness which is by faith." And, when the earth had been renewed by the deluge, God purposed that Noah too should instruct the new generations descending from him for three hundred and fifty years; and that Shem, his second son, should survive him seventy-five years, to the calling of Abraham, — the father of the faithful. Still later, when God brought his people out of Egypt, to give them his institutions, his laws, and his gracious promises, he added forty years to the ripened age of Moses, and sixty-four to that of Joshua the son of Nun, in order that these two great men might have sufficient time, in the wilderness or in Canaan, to accustom Israel to the new discipline of his written word. When, in fine, at the close of the long career of the judges, he chose, in order to prepare for the *régime* of the prophets, to effect that revival in which we see "all the house of Israel lamenting after the Lord," (1 Sam. vii. 2,) he continued the prophet Samuel at the head of the nation for more than fifty years. Then, when he introduced the *régime* of the kings and the temple service, he gave them two prophet kings, each of whom reigned forty years. And when finally he determined to reconstitute the nation around his living Word in the Babylonian exile, he preserved Daniel to them for seventy years.

And when we come to more recent times, we see also that, in the holy Reformation of his church by the gospel, God gave, on the one hand, to the churches of Germany, and, on the other, to those of Geneva and France, thirty years of the ministry of Luther, thirty years of that of Calvin, thirty-three of that of Farel, and forty-six of that of Beza.

Now if this longevity was so frequently adapted to accomplish in the church the great changes divinely decreed, it was much more requisite in the first century, when the church was to be formed from the Gentile races as well as the Jews, for giving to it for the benefit of coming ages the oracles of the New Testament, and thus securing to it, amid the great

revolutions then taking place, a powerful and majestic unity. It was necessary that the apostles, charged with this great work, should enjoy a long life, in order to watch, continuously and unitedly, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, over the progress of the churches, their methods of worship, and especially their universal reception of the Holy Scriptures. It was necessary that the churches should be duly exercised in the life of faith while the apostles were yet with them, since they were after that to be left, until the return of Jesus Christ, to the sole direction of the Holy Spirit and of the written word. And thus it has in fact occurred.

With the sole exception of John's brother, James the Great, (martyr under Herod Agrippa, only ten years after the ascension of the Saviour,) all the apostles exercised a very long ministry in the church.

James the Less, the brother of the Lord and the first of the three pillars of the church (Gal. ii. 9), remained for twenty-eight years at the head of the Jewish Christian churches; and yet all the other apostles survived him, — some of them forty years. Esteemed by the Jews, called by them "the Just," and so revered that the Talmud cites some miracles "wrought by James, the disciple of Jesus the carpenter,"[1] and that Josephus, in recounting his martyrdom (Antiq. xx. 8), declares that "the wisest of the nation deplored his death as one of the principal causes of the ruin of Jerusalem, and of God's anger against the Jews." Simeon, also one of our Lord's brothers, became, the historians say,[2] bishop of Jerusalem immediately after the death of James, and lived, if we may credit Eusebius, to be more than a hundred years old, not being crucified until A. D. 107, after having fed the flock in Jerusalem forty-five years. Peter and Paul ministered to the Jewish and Gentile churches thirty and more years; for we must place their martyrdoms between the burning of Rome in July, A. D. 64, and the death of Nero,

[1] Calmet's Dictionary, Art. James.
[2] Eusebius, H. E. Lib. iii. chap. 2, 11, 32.

June, A. D. 68. Moreover, it appears that the larger portion of the apostles lived still longer; for, although it is impossible to credit the contradictory traditions of the fathers, who date the death of Mark at Alexandria, A. D. 68, Timothy A. D. 97, Thomas and Bartholomew in India, Jude in Lybia, Matthew either in Ethiopia or in Parthia, yet we have the infallible books of the Acts and Revelation, which show us that all the other apostles survived Paul, Peter, and the two Jameses, and that John, exiled in Patmos during a persecution which did not begin before Domitian's reign, nor end before A. D. 96, returned to the coast of Asia in order to complete the Revelation, and to die there. If his brother James, sixty years before, (A. D. 43,) had begun the list of apostolical martyrs, it is he himself who was to terminate the catalogue of their sufferings so long afterwards,[1] at the beginning of the second century. All the traditions of antiquity agree in according to him an extreme old age. Jerome says[2] he could not walk, but was carried to the meetings of the church. He is said to have preached among the Parthians and Indians; but what appears incontestable is, that he lived to an advanced age. Jerome speaks of his sepulcher in Ephesus, whither he had gone to join the family of Mary, our Lord's mother. Irenæus and Eusebius[3] affirm that he died in the third year of Trajan; others say, A. D. 103. If we must believe Epiphanius (Hæres. 51), he was then ninety-four years old; others say still older.

Now this fact of the protracted career of the apostles has great weight when we remember what relations these men of God constantly sustained to the churches which they had founded. For it gives irresistible force to the unanimous testimony of Christianity concerning the twenty-two homologomens; it explains this otherwise inexplicable unanimity;

[1] He underwent many severe condemnations, but alone died a natural death.

[2] See Jerome on Galat. vi. and De Viris Illustr. cap. ix.

[3] Iren. Hæres. iii. 3; ii. 39. Euseb. H. E. iii. 23. Chron. Euseb. See also Augustine, Serm. 253, chap. iv.

it makes it not only explicable, but indispensable. When we remember that the apostles and all their inspired assistants exercised in the church so long and so faithful a ministry during more than half a century, it becomes manifest how all the churches in the world came to be perfectly agreed in accepting the twenty-two books given to them by the apostles before their deaths. And, on the other hand, by an opposite reasoning, if we consider the astonishing fact of this unanimous belief by the churches of the inspiration of these twenty-two books, we see the necessity for the continued presence of the apostles, and their approval of the introduction and use of these books in the churches. We can see, also, how impossible it was that, after so long a ministry, any one should, subsequent to their death, have induced any church to accept any new book to whose inspiration the apostles had not testified; impossible that many of them in such circumstances should have accepted them; still more impossible that they should have received all without exception, nay, without objection; all, too, without leaving to us one sign of hesitation.

Surely (we have already said it, but must repeat it), there is not in history or in criticism an absurdity which may not be admitted, if we allow to this supposition the slightest degree of probability. Let us place ourselves for a moment in the circumstances of those primitive Christians, and inquire how, after a half-century of progress under the ministry of so many inspired men, we should have received, our apostles being dead, any new book which they had not given us in their lifetime; let us ask with what spirit of jealousy, on the contrary, we should have been armed, after their decease, to repel every novelty, to protest against every intrusion, to reject every scripture which did not bear the unquestionable sanction of those men of God.

We shall presently show how much the history of the five later epistles adds to the weight of this argument.

We see, therefore, that there exists a logical and necessary

connection between these two uncontested facts: the long ministry of the apostles in the primitive church and the perfect unanimity of this entire church on the homologomens; and then another connection, still more necessary, between these two facts and the authenticity of all these books.

If any one should to-day tell us that the author of a modern book had watched for forty years over all its successive editions in all Europe, that at the end of that time no one could find among any of the booksellers of Europe the least doubt concerning the authenticity of the book bearing his name, should we not regard such unanimity as a sufficient and unquestionable proof of its authenticity? And yet, how much more powerfully is this double guaranty given us for the New Testament in the long superintendence of the authors and the unanimity of the publishers and guardians of these books! Instead of one author, we have eight; we have all the apostles, vouchers one for the other; we have men of God; we have their inspired companions, Mark, Luke, Simeon (Niger), Timothy, Apollos, Silas, Barnabas,[1] and so many others, who presided for half a century over the churches of God. And, instead of the booksellers of Europe, we have all the churches of Asia, and Europe, and Africa. And, instead of a single book, we have twenty, in respect to which the most perfect unanimity of testimony is immediate, universal, constant, and incontestable.

Still further: to appreciate more perfectly this double guaranty, of so long a superintendence and of so perfect a unanimity, there is one other characteristic feature of the primitive church which we must keep in view. That is, the relations so continued, so intimate, and so numerous, which the apostles sustained to the churches, and the churches to one another. This feature results from all the events of their history, and all the traditions belonging to it. Many examples of it are furnished, the exactness of which we can not guarantee. They tell us, for instance, how the apostle

[1] Acts xiii. 1, *προφῆται*; 2 Tim. i. 6; 1 Tim. iv. 14.

John, in the close of his career, chose for his residence that great city of Ephesus, as the center of the oriental and occidental Christianity, from which he could stretch out his hand to the churches of the two worlds. They tell us — and these witnesses are both ancient and numerous (Caius,[1] Eusebius,[2] Jerome,[3] Victorinus,[4] Chrysostom,[5] Theodore of Mopsuesta[6]) — that the bishops of Asia presented themselves to him in Ephesus, and requested that he would himself leave to the churches of God a gospel which should complete the others.[7] They tell us (Tertullian and Jerome[8]) how a priest of Ephesus had published, under the name of Paul, a book entitled The Acts of Paul; and, when the apostle accused him of the imposture, he pleaded in his defense the pious intention of honoring the memory of Paul. We recall these statements among so many others, only to show more distinctly the vigilance with which the apostles watched the formation of the canon for half a century; for we prefer always to pass by traditions when we have the Scriptures testifying on any point. The Epistles, in fact, and the Acts of the Apostles sufficiently inform us of the constant care of these men of God, and more especially of Paul, toward the churches they founded. He himself declares, (2 Cor. xi. 28,) "The care of the churches cometh daily upon me." And these churches extended from Jerusalem to Illyricum, from Rome to Macedonia and Galatia. He visited them continually; for this purpose he traversed the empire; he was shipwrecked four times in this service; in perils of water, in perils of robbers; in perils of Jews and of Gentiles, in cities

[1] About the year 196. In the famous canon called Muratori's, which many attribute to him. (Kirchhofer, Geschichte des Canons, p. 1.)

[2] H. E. iii. 24.

[3] In Math. Proœm.

[4] In Apocal. Bibl. Patr. iii. 418.

[5] Auct. Incert. Montfaucon, viii. 132.

[6] Catena in Joan, Corderii. Mill. N. T. p. 198; edit. 1723.

[7] If this were admitted to be true, it would not be inconsistent with the theopneusty of this fourth gospel.

[8] Tertullian De Baptism., 15 and 17. Jerome, Catal. Vir. Ill. in Luc. 7.

and deserts; in perils among false brethren; in weariness and painfulness, in cold and nakedness. He sent them his fellow-laborers; he received from them letters and messages; he inquired earnestly after their condition (1 Thess. iii. 5–8; Phil. ii. 19–29); he wept in the prison in Rome on hearing that some of his Philippian converts had gone astray; he lived again if he heard that they stood fast in the Lord; he had a continual conflict of prayer for each one of them, and even for such as had never seen him; he adjured them in the Lord's name that his letters should be read by all the brethren in one church, and then be sent to another; like Peter, recommending that all those of Paul be read with the rest of the Scriptures (2 Pet. iii. 16). He constantly inquired after them with the solicitude of a mother for the infant she had nourished; he watched with jealousy over their doctrines; was in anguish when they wandered; — "who is offended, and I burn not?" he inquires; — he travailed in birth again for those who had strayed, until Christ should be formed in them. These statements concerning this one apostle are so abundantly sustained by his epistles, that we need not indicate the particular passages in this place.

It is then fully manifest how, under the influence of such a ministry, prolonged, in some cases, to fifty, sixty, and almost to seventy years, it was impossible that any book should be fraudulently or carelessly imposed upon the churches, impossible that they should unanimously accept any book which had not received the sanction of these men of God. We can equally comprehend that, after the death of the apostles, at the close of so long a ministry, it was inevitable that all these very churches should be penetrated, not only with a religious respect for all the apostolical institutions, but also with a jealous distrust of all instructions which had not been sanctioned by them while on earth, especially of every book which they had not placed in the sacred canon. Thus it was that the last writings of those who survived the greater part of the apostles, written at the close of their

lives, were seriously distrusted, even to the time of the council of Nice, as we shall presently show at greater length. But we shall also show that these five shorter books of the second canon were, nevertheless, received by the great majority, on account of the positive proofs of their authenticity which accompanied them; and received especially by those churches which were the best situated to judge of them, since they were first directly addressed to them, and since they were the most interested to reject them, if they had been spurious. And we shall show that these very facts present to us an admirable guaranty of the vigilance of the churches, of the freedom of their action, and of the confidence with which their unanimity for the twenty-two homologomens was formed.

In the mean time, we have to consider two other historical facts still more important, which will furnish us new warrants of our sacred canon, and which, joined to the great fact of the unanimity of all the churches of the first centuries on the twenty-two homologomens, prove, with an incomparable force, the authenticity of all these books.

The Immense Number of the Churches at the Time of the Apostles' Death.

The great rapidity of the church's conquests before the death of the apostles, and her immense expansion before the end of the first century, is an astonishing fact, but as well demonstrated as it is marvelous.

This new religion, which promised to annihilate every other, and which, springing up amid the poor and the most despised of the people, attacked all errors, stood face to face against every passion of the human heart, and made no compromise with the pride of the great, the pretensions of the priesthood, or the prejudices of the people; this religion, which, while openly undertaking the overthrow of every false god, however powerful its supporters, however splendid its

rites, however ancient its worship; this religion which was preached at first only by the poor, and which commanded the human race to recognize their God in the person of a Jewish carpenter, whom his own nation had rejected and executed as an impostor; this religion, which had against it the people, their priests, their teachers, their magistrates, and kings; this religion, which required every man to take before God the place of a criminal, and to renounce for it his goods and his life; this religion, always persecuted, without having shed for three centuries any other blood than its own, — this religion had, in forty years, already manifested a power which presaged the conquest of the human race. In forty years, it had spread over the earth; like the Nile in Egypt, it had flowed through the world with the waters of life. The apostles had not yet finished their course, when missionary churches, devoted and numerous, were seen in every country.

This remarkable fact has perhaps been too little noticed in the study of the canon. Yet it is very significant in that connection; while it is abundantly proved to us by both the declarations of Scripture and the testimony of history.

The Scriptures leave us no doubt on this point. Paul, after only seventeen years of his ministry, wrote to the Romans (xvi. 26,) that then already the gospel was made known to all nations; that he himself (xv. 19) had fully preached it from Jerusalem, and round about, unto Illyricum; yea, where Christ was not named. The voice of the messengers of the glad tidings had gone out, like the sun (Ps. xix. 5), to the ends of the earth (Rom. x. 18). Nor was this, in the mouth of Paul, a poetical exaggeration. Judge then from his labors what the whole college of apostles must have accomplished. Moreover, in thus spreading the gospel over the earth, the apostles had only done what their Lord had both commanded them to do, and predicted should be accomplished. Jesus, in foretelling to them the destruction of Jerusalem, which was to take place in thirty-six years, had declared to them: "the gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the

world, for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come" (Matt. xxiv. 14). "Go ye therefore and teach [or disciple] all nations" (xxviii. 19). And this command was so fully accomplished in a short time, that Mark, in writing his gospel, could already say of the apostles, (xvi. 20,) "And they went forth, and preached every where" (*παντα χοῦ*); and that Paul, writing to the Colossians, (about A.D. 60,) said to them, (i. 6,) "The gospel is come unto you, as it is in all the world; and bringeth forth fruit." He even added, (verse 23,) "The gospel which ye have heard, was preached to every creature which is under heaven." And only four years after these words had been written, this same gospel, violently persecuted by Nero, already counted, Tacitus says, in the city of Rome alone, "an immense multitude." Paul, six years before thus writing, was preparing to go into Spain (Rom. xv. 24); and we may even suppose that he did in fact preach there, when we hear Clement of Rome (chap. v. of his 1st Epist. to Corinth.) affirm that he went to the farthest limits of the West (*ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως*). But if the fact of this journey of Paul into Spain remains uncertain, this is sure, that, in the very year when he was preparing to visit Spain, the Jewish Christians assembled in the city of Jerusalem alone were more than fifty thousand, "a great many myriads," James says (Acts xxi. 20: *πόσαι μυριάδες*). And at the same time, so extensive had been the propagation of the word of God in Italy by the obscure but incessant labor of Christian fidelity, that, long before the appearance of any apostle in the country, (Rom. xv. 20; 2 Cor. x. 15, 16.) very many conversions had preceded the coming of Paul. The faith of the Romans was already famed through the world when he wrote them his epistle (Rom. i. 8). And when, three years later, he arrived for the first time in Italy, he already found brethren near Naples, at the port of Puteoli, ready to receive him; and also at the Appii Forum, seventeen leagues from Rome, and, yet nearer, at the Three

Taverns. And, only six or seven years later, before the apostle had laid down his life for Jesus Christ, the Christians of that great capital, forming an immense multitude, were already suffering, in crowds, the most horrible persecutions at the hand of imperial cruelty.

We have already remarked that, to render these important facts incontestable, we still have, besides the testimony of Scripture, that of two of the most shining names of Roman antiquity, both cotemporary with Paul, both pagans, both profoundly prejudiced against Christianity, both consular men, both men of letters, but engaged in the leading events of their time, and writing only what they had witnessed. I speak of Tacitus and of the younger Pliny; the one born A. D. 61, the other A. D. 64; the one consul A. D. 97, the other three years later.

Tacitus wrote, under the form of "annals," the history of his day, from the death of Augustus to that of Nero. In his XV.th book, having reached the eleventh year of this prince, that is, A. D. 64, when Paul was still preaching, he speaks of the terrible fire which ravaged almost the whole capital of the empire, and which all attributed to the malice of Nero. "Eleven of the fourteen sections of Rome had then been burned. To put a stop to the public rumors, Nero sought out criminals, and subjected to the most cruel tortures the infamous and despised wretches whom the people called Christians. Christ, whose name they bore, had been condemned to death by Pontius Pilate under Tiberius; which for the moment suppressed this execrable superstition. But quickly the torrent broke forth anew, not only in Judea, where it began, but even in Rome itself, where all the sewers of the universe meet and disgorge their contents. They began by seizing those who avowed themselves Christians, and then, on their deposition, an immense multitude, convicted less of burning Rome than of hating mankind." *An immense multitude* (multitudo ingens): such is the language of Tacitus as to the number of the Christians that

Rome contained already even in Paul's lifetime. The incredulous Gibbon says on this subject: "The most obstinate skepticism is compelled to respect the truth of this extraordinary fact, which is also confirmed to us by the exact Suetonius; for this historian also mentions the punishments which Nero inflicted on the Christians."

At the same time we also have, in regard to the multitude of Christians in Asia, a testimony of Pliny which is equally authentic and valuable. The intimate friend of Tacitus, and standing high in the confidence of Trajan, Pliny was the proconsul of the beautiful provinces of Bithynia and Pontus, and he had received from his master an order to exterminate the Christians. But, when he had entered on this iniquitous work, his conscience was affrighted by the immense number of the victims, and he wrote the emperor a letter, which is still extant, (L. x. Epist. 97.) seeking to obtain some abatement from the rigor of the original orders. This remarkable letter should be read. It was written in the year 103, while John was yet living. We shall, for brevity's sake, cite only so much as relates to the immense number of Christians, and their fidelity; for, on the shores of the Black Sea, as on the banks of the Tiber, to use the language attributed to Julian the Apostate, their persecutors saw them "arrive in swarms driven to martyrdom, as bees to their hive (tanquam apes ad alvearia, sic illi ad martyria)."

"What, then, Sire, shall I do?" writes Pliny to Trajan. "This has been my course toward those brought before me as Christians. I have asked them, Are you Christians? On their affirmative response I have repeated the question a second and a third time; meanwhile threatening them with death. If they persisted, I had them executed; for, whatever might be the nature of their belief, I deemed at least their resistance and obstinacy worthy of punishment. They affirm that their whole crime consists in meeting together on a certain day before sunrise, to sing alternately hymns to Christ as to a god, and to bind themselves with an oath to

commit no perjury, adultery, theft, or falsehood. After that they separate, to meet again without disorder at a repast of which they partake in common. These statements having been made by them, I deemed it advisable to examine under torture two of their female servants, who, they said, exercised a certain kind of ministry among them; but I was able to find nothing more than an excessive and miserable superstition. What, then, was to be done? For it seemed to me an exceedingly grave case, particularly in view of the great numbers of both sexes, of every rank and age, who are either now exposed to death, or who will be (multi enim omnis ætatis, omnis ordinis, utriusque sexûs, etiam vocantur in periculum et vocabuntur). Nor is it merely in the cities that the contagion of this superstition is spread; it is also in the villages, and even the rural districts (neque enim civitates tantum, sed vicos etiam atque agros, superstitionis istius contagio pervagata est)."

In a word, this great fact which we point out is constantly produced by all the ancient apologists as an incomparable event; often eloquently, triumphantly, as it should be. Read, for example, the beautiful pages of Tertullian, or those of Arnobius,[1] or those of Minutius Felix.[2] "We are so numerous," they said to the Romans, "that if we should leave your state, we should bring it to ruin."

"We are but of yesterday," says Tertullian to the Roman government,[3] "and we have filled every part of your dominion (hesterni sumus et vestra omnia implevimus), your cities, your islands, your fortresses, your guilds, your council-chambers, your regiments, your palace, your senate, your forum. We leave you only your temples (sola vobis relinquimus templa)! We could even make war on you without taking arms; it would suffice merely to cease to live with you; for, if the Christians who compose so great a multitude (tanta

[1] Adv. Gentes, Lib. ii. p. 44, Lugd. Batav. 1651.
[2] Dialog. of Octavius.
[3] Apol. Lib. ii. chap. xxxvii.

vis hominum) had abandoned you to retreat into some other country, it would have been the ruin of your power, and your solitude would have terrified you." Again he says elsewhere,[1] "The Gothic peoples, the various tribes of the Moors, all the regions of Spain, all those of Gaul, and even those of Britain, yet inaccessible to the Romans, have submitted to Christ, as well as the Sarmatians, the Dacii, the Germans, the Scythians, and nations yet unknown." Wherefore this father expresses his wonder that the empire of Jesus Christ should have extended itself in so short a time farther than that of Nebuchadnezzar, of Alexander, or of the Romans.

This period of the church, signalized by such prodigious accessions, extends to the reign of Adrian (A. D. 117–138). Christianity had then abundantly penetrated even to the barbarians, and numerous churches had been founded among the Egyptians, the Celts, and the Germans. We may here cite the words of Irenæus[2] against the gnostics of his day,[3] appealing to "the great number of barbarous nations" (*πολλὰ ἔθνη τῶν Βαρβάρων*), who, he affirms, had already been Christianized before the appearing of the gnostic sects. Now it is perfectly understood that the origin of these sects is placed by the learned in the age of John, even before the publication of his gospel.[4]

If we credit the respectable Armenian scholar, Moses of Chorene,[5] Christianity had penetrated among the Syrians, Armenians, and Persians at a very early period. In fine, we must read the thirty-seventh chapter of the third book of

[1] Adv. Jud. Lib. i.

[2] Hæres. iii. 402. He speaks, too, (Lib. i. chap. 2,) of the church disseminated through all the habitable world (*καθ' ὅλης τῆς οἰκουμένης*) and even to the ends of the earth (*ἕως περάτων τῆς γῆς*).

[3] The heretics of his time, like those of our day, called their systems *the Science* (*Γνῶσις*), called themselves "the Men of Science."

[4] See Bunsen's Hippolytus, tom. i. p. 236.

[5] He has left a *History of Armenia*. Born, it is said, in A. D. 370, he kept the archives before being himself archbishop of Pakrévant.

Eusebius to form any just conception of both the prodigious extension of the gospel under Trajan, and the admirable activity of the churches to promote that end. Through some inflated language you will discover this great historical fact, "that the immediate disciples of the apostles, building on the foundation laid by these men of God, had scattered the seed of the kingdom of heaven in every part of the inhabited world (*τὰ σωτήρια σπέρματα τῆς τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλείας ἀνὰ πᾶσαν εἰς πλάτος ἐπισπείροντες τὴν οἰκουμένην*). Many of them had given away their property to labor as evangelists, to announce Christ to those who did not yet know him, and to make them acquainted with the scriptures of the divine gospels."

It is, then, obvious that this wonderful fact gives immense weight to the testimony of the universal church to the homologomens of our sacred canon. But, to seize the argument in all its force, we must consider in their unity the three great facts which we just noticed; for we think they form by their triple influence a powerful three-stranded cable around these twenty-two homologomens, maintaining their apostolical authenticity and rendering it indestructible. First, the continuance of the personal ministry of the apostles among the churches during the entire first century; next, the immense number of the churches founded by them throughout the world during this long ministry; lastly, the constant, perfect, and universal unanimity of these innumerable churches in regard to these books, both during the lives of the apostles and in the succeeding age. Whoever will attentively regard these three facts thus together will recognize that, in respect to brilliant testimony, literary history offers nothing comparable to it in any age or part of the world.

We here gladly introduce the words of Thiersch[1] after he had presented similar arguments: "I trust it has now been

[1] Versuch zur Wiederherstellung des hist. Standpuncts für die Kritik der N. T. Schriften (1845); chap. vi.

shown to the opponents of the first canon how, in their suppositions respecting the characteristics of the first half-century, they have left the domain of history to amuse themselves in that of fable. They would fain suppose that in a time when the body of Christians and their bishops were certainly not a band of counterfeiters, we had men of such extraordinary skill (yet religious men) that they could, in a manner altogether incomprehensible, impose their fictions on all the Christians of the world, as on a stupid mass, blind and dumb to idiocy, and make them accept with closed eyes these spurious documents as apostolical scriptures, and those transmitted them from a believing antiquity! To this issue must come this strange idea that any one of the homologomens could have been a spurious book, if you bring it into the light of history. And we must avow that the incredulity in respect to the first canon, when perseveringly maintained, requires such a belief of things incredible and monstrous, that, in comparison with this complaisance, the blindest credulity of certain Christians for certain miraculous legends is a mere trifle."

But we have not yet completed our array of facts; for we have one still more important to present, which gives a superabundant weight to our proof. We allude to the anagnosis (*ἀνάγνωσις*), or public reading of the scriptures.

The Anagnosis.

The regular and constant usage of publicly reading the scriptures in all the Christian churches is a cardinal and creative fact in respect to the canon. This fact is so important as not only to entitle it to the first place, but we must see that on this usage rests the entire history of this sacred collection. The anagnosis is the formative cause and real foundation of the canon, the only explanation of its origin; it alone secured its preservation; alone caused the admirable

unanimity of the churches in regard to all the homologomens from the beginning, and for two centuries; alone, too, secured afterward the œcumenical unanimity of all the churches in regard to the entire canon.

The modern opponents of our holy books, especially in Germany, have so well perceived the invincible force of this usage in establishing the authenticity of the first canon, that they have applied all their strength to disprove the fact that the New Testament Scriptures were read in the primitive churches, and to show that it began in the latter half of the second century. But these efforts have been fruitless; the existence of this usage from the earliest period, and its universality, can be fully demonstrated. We shall see that it mounts up to the apostolical times; that it belongs to the very genesis of the church universal; that, at the beginning of the second century, in all the then ancient churches, they were perfectly attached to it; and that in all those afterwards founded by the thousands under Trajan and Adrian, that is, from A. D. 98 to 138, the anagnosis commenced with and constituted their very existence.

Very naturally, therefore, and in the logical course of events, this usage commenced with the church itself. The apostles and their divine Master had already found it established in their national synagogues. The anagnosis had existed for ages in respect to Moses and the prophets; all the synagogues were founded for this purpose; it was ordained, the Jewish doctors say, that wherever ten Israelites were found, a synagogue should be established, and that in every synagogue there should be an ark containing the Scriptures, and that everywhere these Scriptures should be publicly read to the faithful every Sabbath. Now it is well known that in our Saviour's day the Jews were scattered every where, and that, as James says (Acts xv. 21), "Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath day."

And, on the other hand, it is a historical fact that the

primitive church was modeled after the pattern of the synagogue.[1] All the Christian churches for many years consisted entirely of converted Jews, whether in Judea, Samaria, or the Gentile cities. In receiving the gospel, all the new Christians preserved the forms and habits of their worship as practiced in the synagogue: their ministers were called *chazan* among the congregations in Aramean, or *bishops* among the Hellenists. Each of them had three *parnasin* or deacons. The *chazan* every Sabbath selected seven *coreïm* or *anagnosts* (readers) to read the holy Scriptures. He stood near the reader, watching and correcting his reading. The other days of the week he had readers also, but not so many.[2] Thus this holy usage, which had existed in all the synagogues as their most indispensable act, passed into the Christian churches formed in the synagogue, continued in its likeness, and composed of converted Jews exclusively. These first Christians could not imagine a meeting without these holy readings; and no one would have entertained the idea of a religious assembly without the anagnosis. It was thus that this institution, naturally established in all the assemblies of the new people of God, necessarily so constituted them that it would at once be practiced in the natural course of things, even if there had been no requirement of the kind in the apostolical writings. But there was such requirement, as we shall show.

The anagnosis, or scripture-reading in the Christian assemblies, then, preceded the appearing of the New Testament, instead, as some have pretended, of having been introduced at a later period. They read in them the Old Testament, just as in the synagogues; and this regular reading of Moses, the Psalms, and the Prophets was exclusively in use for the fifteen years which preceded the appearing of the first apostolical epistles in the innumerable churches formed by the

[1] Whately's Essay on the Kingdom of Christ.

[2] See Lightfoot, Harm., p. 479; Hebr. and Talmud. Studies on the Gospels, vol. xi. p. 88. Whately too.

apostles, and particularly in those which Paul had gathered, before A. D. 49 or 51, in Samaria, Syria, Arabia, Cyprus, Galatia, Lycaonia, Mysia, Pisidia, Thrace, and Macedon. It is, in fact, in A. D. 49 that we place (after Orosus[1]) the decree of Claudius against the Jews in Rome (Acts xviii. 2); and we know that it was then that Paul, with Silas and Timothy, wrote to the Thessalonians the two beautiful epistles which were, as it appears, the beginning of the written word of the New Testament.[2]

The practice of reading the Old Testament must, as already remarked, have passed from the assemblies of the synagogue to the assemblies of the church, from the very time of the apostles and the beginning of evangelical preaching; for, the year 70 having come, Jerusalem having been destroyed, the temple burned, the Jewish congregations scattered, and all the apostles dead, the spirit of the Christian churches (as all their history shows) had become too hostile to the Jews and Judaizing Christians to have admitted of borrowing any thing further from them, or copying from their institutions.

But also, in these very assemblies of the church, the custom of reading, besides the Scriptures of the old dispensation, the Scriptures of the apostles and prophets of the new (so far as then published), was necessarily adopted by all the churches and believers as at once most natural and indispensable. Were not the writings of the apostles in their

[1] VII. 6. The year 3 of Claudius. Orosus derives it from Josephus. Others place it in 2. Suetonius (25) speaks of this decree, in the life of Claudius, without mentioning the date.

[2] We make no pretensions to determine here the epoch when the gospel of Matthew was written; for it is very probable, as Lardner supposes, that no one of the four gospels preceded the council of Jerusalem (Acts xv.), if that of Mark should be placed later (Mark xvi. 20), and that of Luke shortly after the book of Acts appeared (A. D. 60, 61, or 62). Yet the fact related by Eusebius (H. E. Lib. v. chap. 10) of the gospel of Matthew having been written in Hebrew, which the apostle Bartholomew must have carried into India, would seem to place the first gospel very near the first epistles of Paul, or rather, even before these.

eyes of superior authority to even the writings of the Old Testament? Did not these men of God, in the time when they were writing them, perform miracles displaying even greater power than was shown by the mightiest of the old prophets? Were they not themselves, as apostles and prophets, the twelve founders of the church? (Eph. ii. 20.) And moreover, did not their writings (the gospel of John, for example, and his Apocalypse) claim to be as truly inspired from heaven as Isaiah or the Pentateuch? Why, then, and how, by what right and for what reasons, could they, whilst reading every Sabbath the Scriptures of the old prophets, leave in silence the Scriptures of the new; and, whilst hearing those of the prophets who had divinely announced the Son of Man, could they leave in silence those prophets who had heard him himself and had divinely proclaimed him, "God bearing them witness, both with signs and gifts of the Holy Spirit" (Heb. ii. 4)?

Can we imagine that all these congregations, after the death of the apostles who had founded them, would content themselves with reading publicly only the Old Testament, to be followed by merely the λόγον, the unpremeditated discourses[1] of ministers having neither the miraculous powers of the apostles nor the charisms of those who immediately followed them; and all this to the utter neglect of the apostolical writings? The thought is inadmissible.

If, as some opponents of the canon say, the public recognition of the books of the New Testament by having them read did not exist until the close of the second century, then two historical impossibilities must be disposed of. First, that a revolution could take place in the public worship of all the churches in the world so utterly incompatible with the conservative and traditional spirit which history attributes to the Christians of that epoch. Second, that so great an event, unequaled in the records of that period, could be accomplished without producing any excitement, without

[1] Justin Martyr in his great Apol. chap. 67.

being mentioned by any one of the fathers, even by Eusebius, who records so minutely the recollections of those primitive days, and without being mentioned by Irenæus, in whose youth this astonishing fact must have occurred? These difficulties need only to be mentioned to show the error of the theory in question. No one has ever been able to remove them.

Thus, to him who contemplates in the light of these facts the primitive churches engaged in their worship, and lending every Sunday a respectful ear to the voice of their readers, nothing is more simple to imagine than the gradual formation of the first canon; nothing is more naturally explained than the unanimity of all the churches in regard to it, and their constant preservation of it. It was all done without dispute and without noise, by the calm and regular process of the anagnosis or weekly reading. Let us merely be present at these meetings of the primitive period, and everything is explained. To arrange this matter there was no need of councils, of agitation, of efforts, or of decrees. The apostles had no occasion to issue any orders to institute this reading (although they did give them): it existed before them, "of old time" (Acts xv. 21); it was practised during their lives; it was continued after their death. They had, at most, only to sanction it by their approbation and their participation in it. And when they had all disappeared from the earth, the Christian churches had everywhere acquired such a perfect knowledge of their sacred canon in consequence of this continual reading during half a century, that you would often have seen simple believers who knew the whole Bible by heart, and could correct the reader if he made a mistake in a single word.[1] This the historians attest. It is apparent that there was no need of anything else to make the canon

[1] Such, for example, in Palestine, as John the Blind; St. Anthony in Egypt; Servulus in Rome, (Euseb. *De Martyris Palæst.*, cap. xiii. p. 344; Augustine; *De Doctr. Christ. in Prologo*, tom. iii. p. 3. — Greg. Mag. Hom. xv. *in Evangelia*, tom. iii. p. 40.)

and publish it; to publish it in its purity; to sanction it everywhere; to render it irrevocable.

We see, then, that the reading of the Old Testament had never ceased, either in the synagogue or in the church; it was practised in the first assembling of Christians in Jerusalem; it was always an indispensable part of the public service; it afterward passed from the congregations of the Jewish Christians to those of the Gentile converts; it followed, for example, the faithful of Corinth in the house of Justus (Acts xviii. 7), and of the synagogue of Ephesus to the school of Tyrannus (Acts xix. 9, 10); for all knew, as Paul had said (2 Tim. iii. 15), that by the reading of the Scriptures the man of God is reproved, instructed in righteousness, made wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. And afterward, as one new epistle or a new gospel was given by an apostle to the churches, they hastened to unite with the reading of the Old Testament that of the new prophets, which they recognized as proceeding from the same divine spirit, and which they knew to contain even a greater degree of his influence.

Perhaps, though we do not affirm it, the reading of these new books was not as frequent during the time when the churches still had in the midst of them either apostles possessing eminent signs of apostleship (2 Cor. xii. 12), or men endowed with *gifts* conferred on them for general edification through the laying of hands by these very apostles. At the same time it remains always evident that the churches, once deprived of the personal instruction of these men of God, and having no longer in their possession only the writings left by them, were very careful not to abandon their use to the personal piety of each Christian in his house, but required them to be publicly and solemnly read for the edification of all.

Thus powerfully but silently was effected in the churches of God the successive recognition of all the books of our sacred canon; and, as Dr. Hug says,[1] "just as the publi-

[1] Leonard Hug, *Einleit.* Stuttgard, 1, 108.

cation of a work of profane literature was anciently made by its being recited before the assembled friends of the author,[1] so for the books of the New Testament, it was their anagnosis in the church to which they were respectively sent, that caused them quickly to pass into the common treasury of the sacred books for the whole church of God."

At the same time, while we have showed how, by the simple logic of facts, this anagnosis of the apostolical Scriptures would already by necessity have been established in the primitive churches, even if there had been no order of the apostles to that effect, yet we must bear in mind that this order was given by them; and we easily believe that they composed their epistles and other writings with the intention of having them read in the religious assemblies.

As to the apostolical requirement, we must notice with what remarkable solemnity it was made by Paul in that very epistle which was the first book of the New Testament published (1 Thess. v. 27).[2] "*I charge you by the Lord*," he writes to the Thessalonians, "that this epistle be read unto all the holy brethren." He adjures them by the Lord; and when, toward the end of his course he wrote from Rome to the Colossians, he gave them the same command: "When this epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans (καὶ ἐν τῇ Λαοδικέων ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀναγνωσθῇ); and that ye likewise read the epistle (which will be sent you) from Laodicea." (Col. iv. 16.)[3] Could the churches, in receiving such directions or orders, fail to understand that these letters of the apostles of Christ should stand with the other sacred writings in the public readings?

It must also be remarked that the greater part of these books were addressed not to individuals, but to public men, or particular churches, or to all the church as a body. We

[1] See an example of this in Tacitus. De Oratorib. cap. 7.

[2] Canon, Lib. i. chap. iv.

[3] Τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικείας, believed to be the Epistle to the Ephesians.

might, moreover, point out, as Thiersch has done, in our Scriptures many allusions to the anagnosis as an existing fact in the worship of the times. We there see that the apostles, without giving any superfluous orders about doing that which was already in universal usage, speak as if they expected their books to be publicly read in the assemblies of the church. It is to this usage, for instance, that allusion is made in the beginning of the Apocalypse, (Rev. i. 3,) "Blessed is he that readeth." Here the verb, Mr. Thiersch observes, is in the singular, as designating the anagnost, or public reader. And blessed are "*they that hear* the words of this prophecy." Here the verb is plural, as designating the audience. Why, says Mr. Thiersch, the change from the singular number to the plural, if not in reference to the public reading? The seven appeals in the same book (ii. 7, 11, 17, 29; iii. 6, 13, 22) refer equally to this usage: "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit *saith to the churches*," or assemblies. To this usage, reference is made in those words of John's gospel, (xx. 31; xix. 35,) which show very clearly that the apostle, in writing them, had before his mental eyes the public meeting of the saints, and the public scriptural readings. Now these things "are written that ye might believe." To this usage again those words refer in the epistle to the Colossians, (iv. 17,) addressed to Archippus, and are immediately connected by the copulative with the order he had just given for the public reading of this letter: "Likewise read the epistle [which will come to you] from Laodicea, and say to Archippus, 'Take heed to the ministry which thou hast received in the Lord, that thou fulfil it.'" Dr. Thiersch[1] here remarks again: "Placed as they are, these words appear to be addressed to Archippus, as to the person directing the public readings, and to exhort him to discharge this important ministry faithfully.

But what quotation of Scripture can be comparable, as a

[1] Versuch zur Wiederherstellung des hist. Standpuncts. Dic. p. 349, *et seq.*

monument of the anagnosis, to this famous passage in Peter, (2 Pet. iii. 16,) in which the author mentions "*all the epistles of Paul*," and complains of the abuse of them by many rash men. You can there behold the church in the very attitude of the anagnosis. It is apparent from this passage that, —1. The author here addresses himself to the whole body of the sacred assemblies. 2. Paul had already, in his day, *written* to those assemblies, and all his epistles then known were read in the midst of them; for the author mentions them all, (πάσας,) without designating their number. 3. Paul had written them a sufficient time before this period, to have them become known through the anagnosis by all the churches. 4. If many members of these churches did not understand the doctrines, and wrested them to their own destruction, yet it was a thing already received among them, according to the intention of the author, that all these letters of Paul should be ranked among "the other Scriptures" of the Old Testament, (ὡς καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς,) which had been read for so many centuries in the public assemblies of the church.

There could scarcely be conceived a testimony more positive, if we regard this epistle merely as a document of the first century, and without reference to its author; for we show elsewhere (chap. iv. secs. 3 and 5) its priority to the epistle of Jude; and Thiersch also, in citing it as we do, and for the same purpose, is careful to add: "And if any one should here deny the canonicity of Jude, what difference does it make, since even the most incredulous critic can be forced not to place this writing later than the appearing of the gnostic sect; that is to say, in the second part of the apostolical age?"

Thus, then, this epistle, even for those who would refuse to attribute it to the apostle Peter, whose work it claims to be, is an irrefutable monument of the anagnosis in the first century of the church.

We should, moreover, if we studied the primitive Chris-

tians in their habits and their language, find them universally a people who, for a long time, were accustomed to the public reading of the Scriptures. For instance, the frequent mention of the *anagnosts*, or *readers*,[1] who held rank above the *deacons:*[2] in the East, the custom in all Christian congregations, even the poorest, of preserving in their oratories a copy of the sacred books;[3] the mention of persons, and even of blind men, entirely unlettered, who, like John, the martyr of Palestine, had learned the Scriptures by heart, simply by hearing them read in the churches;[4] the fact of those members of the church who corrected the reader if he merely substituted one word for that in the text;[5] those translators whom they took care to keep in their meetings, for such of the audience as did not understand the language read, — as in Syria for those who did not understand the Greek or Aramean, and in Africa for those who spoke only the Punic or the Latin;[6] and, finally, the usage continued even to the time of Tertullian,[7] among the churches founded by the apostles, of respectfully preserving the original letters received by them from these men of God. This appears to be his meaning in the following words: "Go through the apos-

[1] Cyprian Epis. 24, 33, 34, 29, 38, [others 33]; Bingham, Antiq. vol. ii. p. 27.

[2] Hodie Diaconus qui cras Lector. Tertull. de Præscript. cap. 41.

[3] Scholtz prolog. to Crit. edit. of the N. T.

[4] Euseb. de Mart. Palest. cap. 13.

[5] Bingham, xii. 3, 17; xiii. 4, 10. We might cite still later, as a continuation of the habits thus contracted, and as an example of this earnest solicitude to prevent the slightest change of the sacred text, with what zeal Spiridion resisted Triphilus when in a discourse pronounced before the bishops, he, for a phrase of the gospel, substituted a term which he deemed more elegant, (Sozomen, Hist. XI. chap. i.). We might cite also with Augustine. (Epist. 71 and 85,) what a commotion was made in the church of Africa by the change of a single word, which affected neither faith nor morals. The faithful demanded his reasons, and obliged their bishop to remove the scandal by a serious apology. We see from all these facts how familiar the text of the Scriptures was rendered to the Christians of the first centuries.

[6] Bingham, *Ibid.*, xiii. 4, 5; iii. 13, 4.

[7] De Præscript. Hæretic. chap. 30, p. 212.

tolical churches, where you find still the very pulpits of the apostles,[1] and where you will hear read their authentic letters (*apud quas authenticæ litteræ eorum recitantur*)."

But what may still more fully satisfy certain persons in regard to the high antiquity of the anagnosis of the New Testament is, the testimony of Justin Martyr, only thirty-six years after the death of the apostle John. This distinguished man belonged to Palestine by his birth, to Egypt by his studies, to Asia Minor by his travels, and to the church of Italy by his long residence in Rome as head of a Christian school. He was converted from Pagan philosophy to the Christian faith, A. D. 133; and it was in his famous apology,[2] presented to Antoninus Pius, (A. D. 139,) that he speaks of the anagnosis. His defence of primitive Christianity is the most ancient which has come down to us; and that which renders it particularly valuable in the question before us is, neither its high antiquity alone, nor its eminently public, not to say official character, but the fact that the monuments of that period, whether in profane or ecclesiastical history, are very rare. The epoch of the deaths of the later apostles, as that of the cotemporary reigns of Nerva and Trajan,[3] is historically very obscure,[4] although immediately preceded and followed by very brilliant periods, for both the records of the church and of the empire. As to the documents which might make us acquainted with the habits of the first Christians in their worship, we are reduced to great poverty.

[1] Percurre ecclesias apostolicas apud quas ipsæ adhuc cathedræ apostolorum suis locis præsident (or præsidentur).

[2] In chap. 67. — We refer to the greater apology, which was also the first, although generally printed after the other, composed twenty-four years later, and presented to the Roman Senate under the reign of Marcus Aurelius.

[3] From A. D. 96 to 117.

[4] The great number of the eminent historians of this epoch, so brilliant in the archives of Rome, has not prevented this obscurity; the greater part have perished; and you can find nothing scarcely of the glorious reign of Trajan, but in the letters of Pliny, in the medals, and in the abridgment which we have of the works of Dion.

Commencing with A. D. 53, when Paul describes to us what took place in the church of Corinth, (1 Cor. xi. xiv.) and going forward to A. D. 217, when Tertullian, in his turn, reveals to us the worship of his time, we can find only two other descriptions of the Christian assemblies of those remote days. And of these, the first is only that of a Pagan (the proconsul Pliny);[1] the other that of Justin Martyr, thirty-two years after Pliny.

Let it then be noticed in the testimony of Justin, that if he there is describing the worship of Christians in his day, it is not for the purpose of informing future generations, but simply to prove their innocence to their persecutors, and especially to the emperor Antoninus.

"On the day called Sunday," he says, "there is an assembly[2] of all those residing in cities and the country; and then the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read as long as possible.[3] Then, when the reader has finished his part, the president (*προεστώς*) delivers an exhortation to encourage the audience in the imitation of these noble examples."[4]

Nothing more decisive could be had than this brief description to show us the rank and the important place which "the reading of the apostles and prophets" already held, in the religious assemblies only thirty-six years after the death of John.

We may here also recognize, at first glance, the perfect resemblance of this primitive worship to that of the synagogue; for, in reading Justin Martyr here, we should imagine we were present with Paul and Barnabas in that meeting in Pisidia, which Luke has so well described, seventy-five years

[1] Lib. i. chap. iv. See Canon, chap. ii. sec. 2.

[2] *συνέλευσις γίνεται.*

[3] *Καὶ τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν ἀναγινώσκεται μέχρις ἐγχωρεῖ.*

[4] *Διὰ λόγου τὴν νουθεσίαν καὶ πρόκλησιν τῆς τῶν καλῶν τούτων μιμήσεως ποιεῖται.*

before. He says, they "went into the synagogue on the Sabbath-day, and sat down. And after *the reading of the law and the prophets*, (or, as Justin says, 'the anagnost having finished,') the rulers of the synagogue (the προεστῶτες of Justin) sent unto them, saying, 'Ye men and brethren, if ye have any word of exhortation for the people, say on,' (εἰ ἔστι λόγος ἐν ὑμῖν παρακλήσεως,) (it is the διὰ λόγου of Justin)."

Many efforts have been recently made in Germany to avoid the pressure of this testimony of Justin. Some have tried to see in the phrase "memoirs of the apostles" nothing but apocryphal gospels; but Hug, Winer, Biedermann, Otto, and others have done justice to this singular evasion. Others still have tried to find in it the four gospels merely, to the exclusion of the other books of the New Testament; but Credner[1] and Thiersch[2] have not found it difficult to show, by felicitous citations from Irenæus, (Lib. ii. chap. 27,) and from the apostolical constitutions, (Lib. ii. chap. 59,) that, by such expressions, Justin means evidently the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

Let us, then, adopt the conclusion, that this great fact of the regular and public reading of the New Testament is an institution beginning with the church itself; that it explains the perfect unanimity (otherwise inexplicable) of all the churches in regard to the twenty-two homologomens; that, in connection with this unanimity, it would by itself be an irrefragable proof of the authenticity of these sacred books, and that it makes the intrusion of any illegitimate book into the sacred canon, after the death of the apostles, an impossibility, — an impossibility that such an intrusion should have been allowed in all the churches of the world, and peculiarly an impossibility that this could have been effected without causing innumerable remonstrances; an impossibility, in

[1] Beitrage zur Einleit. in die biblischen Schriften, I. (1832,) p. 60. Credner speaks only of Irenæus.

[2] The same work as quoted above, VI. p. 350, etc.

fine, that the clamor of these remonstrances, if they had taken place, should not have reached us.

But we pass to the monuments of the canon; that is to say, to the traces it has left in the literature of the first Christian centuries.

SECTION IV.

THE VARIOUS MONUMENTS OF THE CANON.

Four kinds of Monuments.

However powerful the arguments thus far presented by us, we are still called on to adduce new proofs taken from the writers of the primitive church; and complaints have often been made of the pretended insufficiency of the testimonies to the first canon furnished by its literature. We shall now produce those testimonies.

The monuments which the canon has left us of its œcumenical use and its authority are of four or five orders.

First, the versions of the New Testament which were early made in various languages, particularly in Latin and in Syriac. But we have spoken sufficiently of these in our first chapter.

In the second place, the few but very conclusive writings of the second century. We shall there distinguish the Christians whose writings remain as belonging to the first or the second half of the century.

Thirdly, the numerous and involuntary testimonies rendered to the New Testament by the ancient opponents of the truth; that is, on the one side, the skeptics of the second century who attacked Christianity; and, on the other, the heretics who at that time tormented the church.

Fourthly, the apostolical fathers, and even the more recent Scriptures of the New Testament.

To enter upon this review, however, with the more clearness, and to avoid superfluous citations, let us first fix the bounds of our field of research.

The Field of Investigation.

This field ought not to extend beyond the first and second centuries. It would be useless to go farther, since the rationalists, who are the most violent against the authenticity of our sacred books, recognize that, from the days of Origen, or the beginning of the third century, everything was settled in the church concerning this great question. It is not until we come down to the celebrated Strauss,[1] that we find a denial of the fact, that, "at the time of this father, our sacred books were universally received as coming from the apostles or their companions." That, then, which our adversaries contest is, the anterior testimonies, the voice of the first and second centuries. Thus, in order to establish our proofs by the literature of the church, we have only to pass it in review, commencing with the closing part of the reign of Septimus Severus, about A. D. 203, and going backward to the close of Paul's ministry and Nero's reign, A. D. 68. It is between these two terms, over the only interval about which our adversaries pretend not to be satisfied, that we are going to erect a bridge, solidly suspended by a triple chain of testimonies. We set out from A. D. 203, in which the great Origen, after having witnessed the martyrdom of his father, began, at the age of eighteen years, his career of instruction in Alexandria; and we come to about A. D. 103, when John in his old age finished his course in Ephesus, or even back to A. D. 68, when Peter and Paul terminated their labors in the city of Rome, after having written, as we think, very shortly before, the one his second epistle, the other his letter to the Hebrews. In other words, we follow the track of our holy books from the last days of Septimus Severus to the

[1] Leben Jesu, part 1.

last days of Nero. Our opponents pretend that over that whole interval they were lost; we must adduce them again, as others have often done, under various forms. For, after all, the history of the church, despite the poverty of its literature at this epoch, still furnishes us abundant material for constructing a continuous road over a firm and secure bridge.

It must not be forgotten, in order to give these historical monuments their true significance and their just value, that the labor of studying them should always be accompanied by a vivid apprehension of the interior life of the church in its totality and its specific character. Dr. Thiersch has set forth among the Germans the importance of this rule, and the mistakes of the men who have disregarded it.

In the mean time, also, to bring the persons and the dates of this important epoch more vividly before the reader's mind, we deem it well to present, in a synoptical table, the series of the only witnesses who can be produced in this research. For that purpose, we place in the order of time, opposite the succession of the emperors: —

1. The fathers, who have left us authentic writings in the first and second centuries.

2. The heretics, who, while combating the truths of the holy Scripture, have rendered testimony to the sacred canon by their very attacks.

3. The enemies of Christianity who, in the very act of assailing it, recognized our holy books as its foundation.

4. The great persecutions which the church has undergone.

5. The apologists who have publicly defended it.[1]

[1] It might have been more logical, but less clear, to leave them in the rank of the Fathers.

3. *The Actors and Witnesses of the first two Cen-*

Reigns.	*Fathers whose authentic writings we have.*
1ST CENT.	1ST CENT.
Nero, A. D. 54 to 68.	James died A. D. 61; Paul and Peter between 64 and 68; Jude much later; and John in 103.
Vespasian, A. D. 69 to 79.	Clement, companion of Paul, as is believed (Phil. iv. 3), and bishop of Rome for nine years (A. D. 91 to 101, according to Eusebius; from 68 to 77, according to Jerome), has left a beautiful letter to the Corinthians.
Titus, A. D. 79 to 81.	
Domitian, A. D. 81 to 96.	Ignatius, hearer of the apostle John, bishop of Antioch in A. D. 68, martyr in 107 or 116, has left seven authentic letters, (some say three,) (to the Romans, Ephesians, and Polycarp,) and we have an authentic contemporary account of his martyrdom.
Nerva, A. D. 96 to 98.	Letter to Diognetus. — The unknown author styles himself disciple of the apostles. It is very beautiful, and was probably written before the year 70. Others refer it to Trajan's reign.
Trajan, A. D. 98 to 100, when Tacitus, Pliny, Plutarch and Suetonius were writing.	Polycarp, born in A. D. 71, martyr in 166, having known John the apostle. He has left an epistle to the Philippians, and we have a beautiful circular letter of the church in Smyrna, recounting his martyrdom to the churches of that day.

turies of the Church, beginning at the death of Paul.

Enemies of the Church.	*Persecutions.*	*Apologists.*
1ST CENT.	1ST CENT.	1ST CENT.
From the apostolical times, besides the Nicolaitans (Rev. ii. 6), the Balaamites (14), the disciples of Simon, (Acts viii. 13), and of Menander (Iren. Hæres. i. 21), those of Phrygellus and Hermogenes (2 Tim. i. 15; ii. 17), of Hymeneus and Philetus, all sects, of which nothing remains, the church was afflicted from the days of John by two numerous orders of heretics, — the Ebionites and the Gnostics.	The first under Nero, A. D. 64 to 68.	
The Ebionites embraced several Judaizing sects, who denied the divinity of Jesus Christ. The Fathers attribute their name, some to *Ebion*, the Hebrew word for *poor;* others to the name of a leader now unknown, who, Lardner believes, was a disciple of Cerinthus.	The second under Domitian, A. D. 93 to 96.	
The Gnostics, or Men of *gnosis* (science), "falsely so called," (1 Tim. vi. 20,) were almost all Docetists or Phantasists, that is, affirmers of the mere *appearance* of a Christ without any real existence. They said the revelation was imperfect, and they completed it by their philosophy, pretending that they alone possessed the true *gnosis* (science), whether by direct and interior intuition or by a tradition going back to the Creation.		
Cerinthus, a Jewish philosopher, having studied in Egypt, went to Asia Minor, where he opposed the divinity of Jesus Christ, being so far an Ebionite. According to Irenæus, John wrote the opening of his gospel to refute this error.		

Reigns	*Fathers whose authentic writings we have.*
2D CENT.	2D CENT.
Trajan still, A. D. 100 to 117.	Justin Martyr, born in Samaria or Sychem about A. D. 103, a philosopher, converted in 133, came at the commencement of Antonine's reign to lecture at Rome, where he suffered martyrdom in 167 under Marcus Aurelius. We have two of his Apologies, a treatise on the Monarchy of God, a Dialogue with Trypho the Jew. His other works, such as his Exposition of the Apocalypse, are now lost.
Adrian, A. D. 117 to 138.	Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, born A. D. 110, converted in 150, died in 170, has left an Apology for Christianity, and some other writings.
Antoninus Pius, A. D. 138 to 161.	Irenæus, born in Asia or Greece A. D. 120, came to Gaul in 177, and was martyred, it is said, in 202. His principal work, Against the Heresies, is in five books. Of all the early fathers one of the firmest and purest, he represents the opinion of the church the most faithfully.
Marcus Aurelius, A. D. 161 to 180.	Athenagoras, a platonic philosopher, born in Athens, became a Christian, established himself in Alexandria, addressed an Apology for Christianity to Marcus Aurelius and his son Commodus. We have also his treatise on the Resurrection.
Commodus, A. D. 180 to 193.	Clement of Alexandria, a platonic philosopher converted, born about A. D. 150 and died in 217; wrote much (Stromata, Exhortations to the Gentiles, &c.). Jerome and Theodoret praise his knowledge and genius highly.
Septimus Severus, from A. D. 193 to 200.	Tertullian, (the oldest Latin Father), born in Carthage A. D. 160, was converted from paganism in 185. He went afterward to Rome; but, dissatisfied with the Roman clergy, he returned to Africa, where he embraced Montanist views on the subject of church government. He died about the year 220. Many of his works have come down to us (Apology, five books against Marcion, &c.).

Enemies of the Church.	*Persecutions.*	*Apologists.*
2D CENT.	2D CENT.	2D CENT.
GNOSTICS.		
Basilides of Alexandria, disciple of Menander, was one of the principal. Born in the first century and died A. D. 130; he taught his doctrine of magic under Trajan and Adrian. Isidorus, his son, added other reveries, and made a sect.	The third under Trajan, from A. D. 107 to 117; under Adrian, to 136.	Quadratus, bishop of Athens, presented an Apology to Adrian in A. D. 131. Eusebius preserved a fragment of it.
Cerdo came from Asia Minor to teach in Rome A. D. 132. Hyginus, bishop of Rome, excommunicated him about 140.	The fourth under Marcus Aurelius, from A. D. 163, because Christians abstained from the solemnities of his triumph.	Aristides, A. D. 175, a converted philosopher.
Marcion, born in Synope, of which his father was bishop, became a pupil of Basilides, taught in Alexandria A. D. 117, wrote twenty-four books of Commentaries on the Gospels, of which Clement and Epiphanius have preserved fragments. He came to join Cerdo in Rome about 140, being there at the same time with Valentine and Justin Martyr under Antoninus Pius.	The fifth under Septimus Severus, from A. D. 202, throughout the empire.	Justin Martyr made two, which we have: one to Antonine in A. D. 139, the other to Marcus Aurelius in 163.
Valentine, of Egypt, came also to instruct in Rome under the bishops Hyginus and Anicet, (from A. D. 139 to 157,) and finished his course in Cyprus. He fancied thirty Œons, or inferior deities. He had many followers, who originated several sects, as the Colobarsa; Ptolemy in 140; Heracleon; Tatian, who, at least, adopted his Œons; Bardesanes, a Syrian who lived in Edessa, in 172, and who closed by combating his master. He wrote much and ably.		Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, presented one at the same time.
Carpocrates the Egyptian, and his son Epiphanes. He taught under Adrian a mystic and licentious antinomianism.		Apollinarius, bishop of Hierapolis, during the persecution of Marcus Aurelius in 169.
Tatian, born in Mesopotamia, orator and philosopher, at first pagan, came to Rome, and be-		Melito, bishop of Sardis, presented one in 172. It has perished.
		Tatian, before his fall, composed a "Discourse against the Greeks."
		Athenagoras, an Athenian philosopher, taught in Alexandria in A. D. 177, presented an Apology to Marcus Aurelius entitled "Deputa-

Reigns.	*Fathers whose authentic writings we have.*
2D CENT.	2D CENT.

Enemies of the Church.	*Persecutions.*	*Apologists.*
2D CENT.	2D CENT.	2D CENT.
came a professed Christian. After having heard Justin Martyr, he for a long time gave himself out as his disciple, and composed a Discourse against the Greeks, dying in 178. But he had fallen into gnostic errors, and became in the East head of the Encratites. He wrote, besides a multitude of other works, a Harmony of the four Gospels, now lost, but extant in the time of Eusebius. There is supposed to be an apocryphal Latin translation of it.		tion in favor of the Christians," and a treatise "On the Resurrection," which is also an apology. We have them still.
EBIONITIC-GNOSTIC SECTS.		
Theodore, a tanner of Byzantium, came A. D. 192 to Rome, where he was excommunicated by Victor in 194. He said that Jesus Christ was created by the Father, but before the creation of the world.		
Artemon, his disciple, accused of removing the passage 1 John v. 7 from the text.		
PAGAN ADVERSARIES OF CHRISTIANITY.		
Celsus, an epicurean philosopher under Trajan and his successors. An ardent enemy of Christianity, he assailed it with the weapons of reason and ridicule in his Logos Alethes, of which we have only fragments in Origen's refutation.		
Lucian of Samosata, born about A. D. 120, composed satirical dialogues, in which he attacked Christianity. He dedicated his False Prophet to Celsus.		

Reigns.	*Fathers whose authentic writings we have.*
3D CENT.	1ST HALF OF 3D CENT.
Septimus Severus, from A. D. 200 to 211.	Origen, born in Alexandria in A. D. 185, saw the martyrdom of his father in 202, took the place of Clement of Alexandria in his school, traveled much, accomplished immense labors, and died in 253.
Caracalla, A. D. 211 to 217.	Hippolytus, bishop, first in Arabia (as Eusebius says), an intimate friend of Origen, a Greek theologian, distinguished historian and mathematician, came afterward to Italy about A. D. 222, and martyred between 235 and 240.
Heliogabalus, A. D. 218 to 222.	Julius Africanus, a Greek historian and chronologer, converted to Christianity about A. D. 231, a friend of Origen; he wrote Commentaries on the N. T. We have only fragments in Eusebius.
Alex. Severus, A. D. 222 to 235.	Dionysius of Alexandria, bishop A. D. 232, died in 247. His numerous works are lost, though often cited by Eusebius.
Maximin, A. D. 230 to 237.	Caius, priest of Rome, A. D. 210. Fragments only in Eusebius.
Gordian, A. D. 237 to 244.	Cyprian, born in Carthage A. D. 202, bishop in 248, died in 258. His works, in Latin (sola clariora, says Jerome), form a large volume.
Philippus, A. D. 244 to 249.	
Decius, A. D. 249 to 251.	

N. B. Let us carefully notice that, if in this table we have sought to coördinate the dates of the heresies of the second century, it should be re-

We hope that this chronological table of the reigns, the fathers, the adversaries, and the heretics, may throw a useful light over the study we are about to pursue, by reducing its elements to the most precise terms, by showing their limited number, and by arranging them coördinately. We have omitted, in the column of the reigns, those of less than a year's duration; in the column of the heresies, those which did not last a year, (like the Ophites, whom Hippolytus

Enemies of the Church.	*Persecutions.*	*Apologists.*
1ST HALF OF 3D CENT.	3D CENT.	3D CENT.
Manes, born in Persia, founder of Manichæism, which he partly borrowed from Zoroaster. They say he was flayed alive in Persia A. D. 271.	The sixth persecution under Maximin in 235.	Ammonius Saccas, (or Saccophorus) a philosopher, founder of eclecticism, composed at the beginning of the century a book "of the Agreement of Moses and Jesus Christ." Nothing of it remains.
Porphyry (*Malchus*), a neoplatonic philosopher, born in Tyre A. D. 233, pupil of Longinus and Plotinus at Athens, and mystical philosopher in Rome, where he died in 304. He composed five books against the Christians. Theodosius had them burned; but fragments survive in Eusebius and Jerome. In the first book he had collected the apparent contradictions of Scripture; in the fourth he attacked Moses; in the thirteenth, Daniel.	The seventh under Decius from 250 to 253.	Tertullian made his beautiful Apology in Latin in 202.
Amelius, a Tuscan, disciple of Plotinus from A. D. 246 to 270, when he went to live at Apamea. He was, like Porphyry, an enemy of Christianity.	The eighth under Valerian, in 257.	Minucius Felix, an African orator, in A. D. 220 composed (in Latin) his Apology at Rome in the form of a dialogue, entitled Octavius. We have it entire.
	The ninth under Aurelian, from 272 to 275.	
	The tenth in the fourth century, through the whole empire, from A. D. 303.	

membered (as Cave and others complain) that their chronology is utterly confused.

places in John's day,) or those who, sound in the doctrines of God and Christ, were only wrong in discipline,[1] (as the Montanists,[2] Quartodecimans[3]); and, in the column of the fathers, on the one side, those whose books have perished, or

1 See in Bunsen's Hippolytus, tom. i. p. 231, the thirty-two sects which this father counted in his day.

2 Or Cataphrygians, toward the year 161.

3 In the dispute of the Passover, in second and third centuries.

are found only in small fragments in Eusebius and elsewhere, (as Papias,[1] Hegesippus,[2] Pantænus,[3] Melito,[4] Dionysius of Corinth,[5] Asterius Urbanus,[6]) and, on the other hand, those whose pretended writings are recognized by the most esteemed critics[7] as not attributable to them.

To render our review of all these monuments of antiquity more clear and impressive, we begin with the most recent; and mounting upward in the order of time, we first consult the least ancient of the Fathers to reach those of the last half of the second century, from them to those of the first half, then to the apostolical fathers, and finally to the apostles themselves who wrote the last books of the New Testament.

SECTION V.

TESTIMONY OF THE FATHERS OF THE SECOND HALF OF THE SECOND CENTURY.

The united testimonies of Irenæus, Clement, and Tertullian.

If we place ourselves at the opening of the third century, A. D. 202, whilst the terrible persecution of Septimus Severus was bursting forth over the whole breadth of the empire, and whilst the young Origen, who had just witnessed the decapi-

1 Bishop of Hierapolis, in 118. He had heard John, (ἀκουστής) Irenæus says, was a friend (ἑταῖρος) of Polycarp. He had composed five books. (Euseb. ii.; E. iii. 39).

2 The earliest church historian. He lived from A. D. 100 to 170, having traveled much to see the apostles and prepare his history, fragments of which Eusebius and Photius have preserved.

3 Head of the Alexandrian School, about the year 179.

4 Bishop of Sardis, about 170.

5 Bishop of Corinth, about the same time.

6 Bishop in Galatia, about 186.

7 See Hefele, (*Patr. Apostol. Opera,*) Proleg. pp. 9, 80.

tation of his father Leonidas, was beginning in Alexandria his long and brilliant career, we find on the scene of the world three great lights in high places, that have ever since that day been illuminating the church: Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian. While Origen was making those immense researches in biblical science, which, notwithstanding his errors, will for ever render his name dear to the churches of God, these three great men had been attracting the attention of all Christian people, and their writings were scattered into every part of the empire. Like three light-houses, they stood at great intervals, casting their beams far and wide: Irenæus beyond the Alps, in the distant metropolis of the Gauls, where Latin, Greek, and Celtic were spoken; Clement in the learned Alexandria, where they spoke Coptic and Greek; and Tertullian in Carthage, the metropolis of proconsular Africa, where they spoke the Latin and Punic tongues. Irenæus, upwards of eighty years old, had for a quarter of a century been feeding the flocks of Lyons, and was to terminate in this very year 202 his long career by martyrdom:[1] Clement, at the age of fifty-two, was not to die until A. D. 217, and the great Tertullian, the oldest of the Latin Fathers, then in his forty-second year, but converted seventeen years before and priest of Carthage ten years, was about to exercise in Africa, as in all the Latin church of the West, a long and beneficent influence. We remember the respect for his memory afterward expressed by the bishop and martyr, Cyprian, in this very Carthage. Two centuries later the famous Vincent of Lerins[2] said, "What Origen was for the Greeks, Tertullian was for us Latins, that is to say, incontestably the first among us (nostrorum omnium facile princeps). Who was more learned than this man, and who was more exercised in things divine and human?"

It would be impossible to imagine, for the second half of

1 Yet the fact of this martyrdom is not quite certain.

2 Edit. of Baluze (1663), p. 323.

the second century, three men more competent to testify concerning cotemporary belief in regard to the sacred Scriptures. Everything commends them to our confidence in this respect, — their character, their erudition, their labors, their travels, the esteem which they enjoyed, and all the sacrifices they had themselves made for the sake of the Scriptures. Besides, if we designate them as representatives of the second century in its second half, their testimony (especially that of Irenæus) goes back, by the circumstances of their lives, much farther than the commencement of their ministries. It extends even to the times of the apostles. We know, in fact, the famous letter of Irenæus to Florinus,[1] in which he recounts his familiarity in early life with Polycarp, who himself, he says, had been a hearer of John, and who related to him his pious reminiscences, "wholly conformed to the Holy Scriptures," as he was careful to add. Besides this, what gives the greater weight to the testimony of these three men, is that their still extant writings are very copious. Those of Irenæus (Grabe's edition,) form one folio volume of about five hundred pages; the best edition of Tertullian (Venice, 1746,) is also in large folio; and the best of Clement of Alexandria (Greek-Latin) in two folio volumes. Moreover, these three witnesses, particularly Clement and Tertullian, would not have been converted from the paganism of their age to the profession of the gospel, but for the powerful testimony to the sacred books which they found, and for the common, constant, and undisputed conviction of the cotemporary churches which they saw. They had had before their eyes conclusive reasons for abjuring their ancient errors, and for believing in the divinity of the Scriptures. All three, practised from their youth in scientific investigations, had possessed every facility for determining the certainty of these books which were to form thenceforward the rule of their lives. All three had visited Asia, Greece, and Italy; they were in intimate relations with the men of every

[1] Hist. Eccl. i. 5; chap. 19, 20; Iren. *Adv. Hæres*, Lib. iii. chap. 3.

country who represented the science of their times. They lived, also, very near the sources of information, being almost cotemporary with the immediate successors of the apostles; so that in submitting themselves to the Scriptures already received as divine, and embracing this universally persecuted faith, they were in possession of all the means, as well as all the motives, for testing the legitimacy of the sway which the sacred books had obtained throughout the Christian churches.

Would we now hear the voice of the second century, and take, as it were, its vote on the canon of the Scriptures? Let us open one of the important works of these great divines, and say if it would be possible to imagine fuller testimony, either to their personal convictions, or to the universal persuasion which prevailed in their day among all the churches of the East and of the West. Indeed, we shall find ourselves embarrassed with the very abundance of this testimony. It seems to us that it is to neglect, and enfeeble it even, to make quotations from it; and all we can say will ever be wholly below the impression which every one must receive from a simple reading of their books. Let them be taken up for one day only, and they will make a deeper impression than all our words. You fairly swim in the Scriptures, as you read their pages. You find yourself transported into the midst of a generation which saw things in the light of the New Testament. You there hear the men of that generation appealing to our sacred books to establish a truth, as we appeal for a visible object to the sunlight around us. All their pages show them to us as constantly resting on the oracles of God, as on the only foundation of their faith, and of the faith of all; they are ministers of this word only; and if they quote it as *their* rule, it is because it is equally the rule of every one, and that to oppose it is, they say, "to avow yourself a heretic," "to forsake the church;" for all the church ranks itself, in this matter, as one man. This word is for them the sovereign law which must judge every

heresy, past, present, or future, as it is that which will shortly judge the living and the dead. We do not think that a modern author can be found who has made in his writings more frequent appeals, or with such absolute deference to the infallible authority of this holy word. Not only the large volumes of these three men are entirely penetrated with them; not only is it a tapestry in which the passages of Scripture are constantly interlaced like threads of gold, strengthening and enriching the tissue, but you feel instinctively that such language could have been employed only among a people long submissive to the written word, and accustomed to bow, as one man, to its authority.[1]

But, before giving specimens of their testimony, it may be well to notice some general traits which characterize it.

Seven Characteristics of their Testimony.

1. These fathers do not confine themselves simply to *quotations* of the twenty books of our first canon; they speak very frequently of the *collection* itself of these books as forming one entire book, *a New Testament*, which the church of their day has fully accepted, which she has united to the sacred oracles of the old covenant, and which she calls THE SCRIPTURE, or THE SCRIPTURES, THE NEW INSTRUMENT, THE NEW TESTAMENT, THE LORD'S SCRIPTURES, (τὰς κυριακὰς γραφάς, *Dominicas Scripturas*,) THE DIVINE SCRIPTURES, (τὰς θείας γραφάς,) THE GOSPEL, and THE APOSTLE. For these fathers hold equally all the epistles as forming one single book, which they call THE APOSTLE; and the four evangelists also as forming one single tetramorphous GOSPEL, (a gospel in four forms,) to which they join the Acts of the Apostles.

[1] See Mr. Kirchhofer's precious collection of what he deemed the most remarkable passages of these fathers on each of the books of the canon: "Quellensammlung zur Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Canons bis auf Hieronymus: Zurich, 1842." See passim, pp. 17 to 29.

2. Another feature of their testimony is, that they habitually associate the Old and the New Testaments as a succession of books of the same origin and of equal authority.

3. They invariably declare their faith in the divine and complete inspiration of all these Scriptures; they rank them with those of the other prophets; they distinguish them from every uninspired book, and from all pretended tradition which is not conformed to them; they call them "the oracles of God," "the pillar and ground of the faith," "the rule of truth," "the theopneustic Scriptures," "the perfect Scriptures," "the Scriptures pronounced by the word of God and by his Spirit;" and they declare of the sacred writers, that "they were *all pneumataphores*, (bearers of the Holy Spirit,) and all speak by one and the same Spirit of God."

4. Moreover, they profess this perfect faith in the divine inspiration of all these books, in connection with the entire church; they present it as the faith common to every Christian in the world; they declare that to raise one's self against this œcumenical rule of the truth is, in the view of each of them, no longer to belong to the Christian church; it is to abandon it, (*exeuntes*,) because there can be found in no cotemporary church the least dissent from it.

5. So calm and sure is their persuasion in this matter, so universally peaceful is this conviction among the Christians of their time, that you will never find them occupied with defending it. Why should they? The point is everywhere firmly settled; it is in every conscience that professes the truth; it is nowhere contested in the church of the second century; and you can nowhere hear against one of the twenty books of the canon a single one of those objections which are started by the biblical critics of our day. They hold them as the universal and uncontested code; when they adduce a passage to establish some disputed truth, it is always as when one puts a lamp in a dark place to reveal something that had been hidden. One may dispute with you about the *object*, but no one thinks of questioning the *light;* that is the

same for every one. The Scriptures, — they are the light. This confidence, common to every one in the second century, is always taken for granted; they never demonstrate it. If I am speaking of the Rhone in Geneva, do I stop to prove that it runs through this city, and that you will find water there? Why, then, should these three doctors demonstrate to the men of their day that the river of Scripture runs through the city of God, and that you may there find abundance of the living waters of grace? They never do it. In all their folios, they discuss the biblical meaning of such and such a word, never its divinity; they profess to be the interpreters of the New Testament, never its defenders. Why should they defend it? No one in the church had attacked it; and if you will meet despisers of the Word, you must go out and search for them in the Roman schools of Cerdo, Marcion, or Valentinus.[1]

6. Still, a sixth feature is, that in religious matters everything is decided for them, and should be for the whole church, as soon as it is known that the Scripture has spoken on it. "The Scriptures," they say, "are a perfect revelation of Christian truth;" "their instruction is abundant," (scripturarum tractatio plenissima,) "admitting neither of addition nor retrenchment." "I adore," they say, "the fullness of the Scriptures." "Let no one," they add, "teach anything, unless he can say of it, 'It is written.'" Let no one allege any tradition; for them there is none which can stand against the declarations of the written Word.[2]

7. Finally, they say, "It is to the Scriptures that every appeal must be made for explaining the Scriptures, (ἀπ' αὐτῶν περὶ αὐτῶν,) if we would arrive at the truth in a convincing manner (ἀποδεικτικῶς)."

Let us, then, hear more minutely these three great divines

[1] Leaders of three heretical sects, bearing their respective names, taught in Rome during the second half of the second century.

[2] These various expressions we shall meet again, and indicate their places.

of the second century, by briefly citing them in turn. These quotations could be indefinitely multiplied; our difficulty lies only in selecting, for they abound in all their writings, and even stronger than we quote could be found; but we have selected those which put in the strongest light the six or seven features we have here specified. We shall commence with the youngest, Tertullian, priest of Carthage.

Tertullian.

Although the youngest of these three divines, Tertullian is the oldest of the Latin fathers whose writings we possess. Born in paganism, only about fifty years after the death of John, this eminent man, whose father was a centurion in the African army, was instructed in pagan philosophy and jurisprudence. At the age of thirty-five years, he was converted, by witnessing the execution and the Christian constancy of some of the martyrs. From this time, he consecrated to the gospel of Christ his genius and his strength, with all the devotion of a resolute heart. The injurious treatment which he considered himself as receiving from the clergy of Rome obliged him, about A. D. 207, to take his pen against the corruptions of the church; and soon he became a Montanist. This severe sect appears to have erred especially in its excessive views of discipline, and in exalting the visions of its prophets to the rank of the Scriptures. Tertullian died about A. D. 220. His principal works are five books "Against Marcion," written (as he informs us) the fifteenth year of Severus, A. D. 207;[1] his admirable "Apology," about A. D. 217; his books "Against the Jews" and "Against the Heretics," his treatises on Shows, the Soul, Monogamy, the Soldier's Crown, the Cloak, the Resurrection, etc.

[1] The dates we find in a very able dissertation on Tertullian, an extract of which is in the beginning of his "Apology" (translated by Giry: Amsterdam, 1712), the fanciful dates of Pamelius and Baronius are there refuted.

Now Tertullian made constant use of the Scriptures; he distinctly quotes each one of the twenty books of the first canon,[1] without forgetting even the short letter to Philemon;[2] and we have already showed the words of the learned Lardner[3] in reference to these innumerable testimonies of Tertullian to the canon: "The citations from the New Testament made by this father alone are more extensive and more abundant than those from the books of Cicero by all the writers of every class and age."

Tertullian, in his book of "Prescriptions,"[4] exclaims, "How happy is this church, how happy! She knows one only God, creator of all things; a Christ Jesus, born of a virgin, Son of the God Creator; and a resurrection of the body. She *blends the law and the prophets* with *the writings of the evangelists and apostles;* and it is thence she refreshes her faith, (legem et prophetas cum evangelicis et apostolicis miscet; et inde potat fidem)." In his book on Monogamy,[5] speaking of second marriages, and quoting a sentence of the New Testament (1 Cor. vii. 39), he uses, he says, "a Latin version which is not very accurately conformed to *the authentic Greek text* in the translation of this passage, (sciamus plane non sic esse in Græco authentico)."

The expression "New Testament," for the collection of our holy books, was already in use in his day; but they had previously called the two volumes "*the one and the other Instrument*," and Tertullian gives his testimony to the antiquity of the usage, not only of having a collection of our Scriptures, but of uniting this new collection with the old.

[1] We speak here only of the first canon, without saying, with Kirchhofer (p. 263, Quellensammlung: Zurich, 1842), "that he cites equally all the canonical books of the New Testament;" if it is not (as this author also observes) that we there find only three allusions more or less questionable to the epistle of James.

[2] Adv. Marcion, Lib. v. cap. 42.

[3] Canon, chap. ii. sec. 2.

[4] De Præscript. Hæreditor. chap. xxxvi.

[5] Chap. xi. p. 532, of the edit. of Basle, 1515.

In his fourth book "Against Marcion," (chap. i.) in complaining of the heresy of this man who pretended to establish an opposition between the God of the law and the God of the gospel, he calls the law and the gospel "*the one and the other Instrument*, as it is now more usual to say *the one and the other Testament*," (alterum alterius Instrumenti, vel, quod magis usui est Testamenti).[1] And in his book of the "Prescriptions,"[2] he exclaims: "If Marcion has separated the New Testament from the Old, (Novum Testamentum a Vetere,) he is then later than the book which he divides; for we can separate only what has been united."

A dogma, according to Tertullian, ought not to be preached unless we can say of it, "it is written." "Woe to them who add or retrench anything to or from *that which is written*." "To wish to believe without the Scriptures (of the New Testament) is to wish to believe against them."

In his treatise "Against Hermogenes,"[3] in speaking of a certain doctrine, he says: "We can affirm nothing in regard to it, because the Scriptures do not explain it, (Nihil de eo constat, quia Scriptura non exhibet)." So, too, in his book "Of the Body of Christ:"[4] "They prove nothing, because *that is not written* (Non probant, quia nec scriptum est, nec, etc.)."

In his essay "Against Praxeas:"[5] "Thou shalt also prove thy sayings, *by the Scriptures*, not less clearly than we prove that God has made his Son of his own Word." "Let us refer these questions to *the Scriptures of God* (Revocando quæstiones ad Dei literas)."[6]

In refuting an error of Hermogenes,[7] he says: "Let the

1 Observe him, in the same manner, employing many times elsewhere this term of "New Testament" to designate the canon. Thus, ad Praxeam, chap. xv. p. 508, edit. of Rigalt, Paris, 1634.

2 Chap. xxx. p. 212, Paris edit. 1629.

3 Chap. i. p. 233, Paris edit. 1664.

4 Chap. vi. p. 312.

5 Chap. xi. p. 505.

6 De Animâ, chap. ii. p. 265.

7 Adv. Hermogenem, chap. xxii. p. 241.

heretics bring their doctrines *to the Scriptures alone:* then they can not stand."

In the same book, in speaking first of all the Scriptures, then in opposing to their whole body the New Testament, or the gospel, he exclaims, "I adore the fullness of Scripture; but, besides, in the gospel, I find the same word of the Creator as minister and judge (In Evangelio vero amplius et ministrum atque arbitrum Factoris invenio sermonem.)"

He says again, "And as to the point in question, let the workshop of Hermogenes show us that it is written. But if it is not written, let him fear that '*woe unto you*' uttered against all that shall add to or take from the words of the book."[1] And again, in his book of the "Prescriptions," indignant at the rashness of the heretics whom he is refuting, and holding the axiom that "all faith should be founded on the Scriptures," he exclaims, "Well, if they will believe contrary to the Scriptures, let them believe without the Scriptures!"[2]

And now, if from proconsular Africa, we pass over into Egypt, we hear Clement of Alexandria rendering, with equal affluence, similar testimony.

Clement of Alexandria.

This father, older than Tertullian, died only three years before him, about A. D. 207. In his first book, "Stromata,"[3] he speaks of himself as "very near to the time of the apostles." Born in paganism, and versed in all the science of the Greeks, he had long been teaching their philosophy when he was converted in Egypt through Pantænus, the pious and distinguished head of the Christian school of Alexandria. And when Pantænus left that city, about A. D. 189, to carry

[1] Alluding to Rev. xxii. 18, 19.

[2] Chap. xxiii. p. 210; and chap. viii. p. 205. See also Euseb. H. E. Lib. v. chap. 11; and Lib. vi. chap. 13.

[3] Strom. Lib. i. p. 274.

the gospel to India, Clement took his master's place in that institution. By his philosophical science and the charm of his instructions, its fame was greatly raised. Many ancient authors[1] assure us that he was born in Athens, and that it was in that famous city he had acquired his learning and formed his eloquence. However that may be, it had long been the custom to call him Alexandrinus, to distinguish him from the celebrated Clement of Rome, whom all the church had honored a hundred years before. In A. D. 202, being forced by the persecution of Septimus Severus to fly from Egypt, he went to Jerusalem, and thence to Antioch; but he afterwards returned to Alexandria to resume his instructions, which he continued until his death, toward the end of Caracalla's reign. He had an active mind, a prodigious memory, and great zeal for promoting the faith. Unhappily for the church and for himself, but to the great admiration of his age, he employed his genius in seeking to form an alliance between the religion of Jesus Christ and the philosophy he had always taught. He attempted to use his Platonism as an introduction to Christianity; and it is thus that this man, otherwise pious, powerfully contributed to lower the faith and spiritual life of the Eastern churches. Never and nowhere was such an effort made without altering the doctrines of original sin, the foundation of all the teachings of Jesus Christ, but a foundation universally rejected by human wisdom. We cite this author here only as a very faithful representative of the views of his age in regard to the canon of the Scriptures, not as an interpreter of Christian truth. He received, in fact, the suffrages of all the ecclesiastical authors who came after him. Eusebius[2] says, "His writings are full of the most varied and useful erudition;" "full of erudition and eloquence," Jerome[3] says, "as well on the divine Scriptures as on all the documents of secular literature." "What is

[1] See, among others, Epiphan. Hæres. xxxii. n. 6.

[2] He particularly speaks of the Stromata, H. E. vi. 13.

[3] The Scrip. Eccl. chap. 18; and Ep. ad Magnum, chap. 2.

there in these writings which is not learned, and even which does not come as from the center of philosophy?"

His principal writings that have come to us, are his "Exhortation to the Gentiles;" his "Pedagogue," in three books; his "Rich Man Saved," a treatise addressed to the rich; especially his "Stromata" (or Tapestries), in eight books, a collection abounding in his Christian or philosophic thoughts. He attempts there to introduce his readers in some measure to what he calls a gnosis (or science) more profound; and this work, as he himself informs us,[1] must have made its appearance A. D. 192, "two hundred and twenty-two years after the battle of Actium," he says. It is believed also that Cassiodorus[2] has presented a fragment of his "Adumbrationes" or Sketches on the Catholic epistles — only brief fragments of his "Hypotyposes" remain. It was a concise exposition of the contents of the New Testament.[3]

Now the use made of the New Testament Scriptures, the quotations from them, the appeals to their infallibility as to the sovereign judge of controversies, and to the only source of all divine truth even of the mystic traditions which Clement admitted; in fine, the frequent expression of his confidence in their universal inspiration, all these are found in abundance in the writings of Clement. And it is not only his personal faith in the whole Bible which he expresses on almost every page; it is not only his faith in each of their books (for he never ceases to cite them); it is the faith of the Church. You may read in the useful collection of Mr. Kirchhofer,[4] an abundant array of these quotations. In speaking of the Stromata this professor remarks, "Clement, on almost every page, quotes sentences taken from the New Testament, from all the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, each of Paul's letters, the first of Peter, the first and second

[1] Strom. Lib. i. p. 339.
[2] Therefore with a Latin title.
[3] Potter's Oxford edit. 2 vol. fol. 1715, is the best.
[4] Quellensammlung, etc., p. 22.

of John, that of Jude, that to the Hebrews, and the Apocalypse." Nothing of the first canon is left unquoted except the short epistle to Philemon. But this is a mere accident, due entirely to the brevity of this letter, which contains only twenty-five verses, and has nothing doctrinal in it. It appears even, according to Eusebius, that it was cited in his Hypotyposes, now lost; and as we have just seen, it was mentioned by Tertullian in Africa at that very time,[1] and at the same time also, it was so well known throughout Christendom, that at Rome the audacious Marcion himself reckoned it the ninth of Paul's epistles.[2] "It is only the diminutive size of this epistle," writes Tertullian,[3] "that saved it from the forgeries of Marcion." And Jerome,[4] in his eulogium upon it, tells us that if it had not been believed to be from Paul, "it would not have been received by all the churches throughout the world."

"In his book of Hypotyposes," says Eusebius,[5] "Clement has made very abundant expositions of all the Canonical Scriptures, not even excepting the antilegomens."

Rather then than exhibit here the principal passages in which each one of our sacred books is mentioned by Clement, we think it will be more useful to show simply by some citations in what terms this father constantly speaks of the Scriptures of the New Testament.

In the third book of the Stromata,[6] Clement distinguishes expressly the four canonical gospels from the apocryphal gospel of the Egyptians. Speaking of a strange sentence attributed to our Saviour by Cassianus the heretic, he says, "And first we find this passage nowhere in the four gospels transmitted to us, (παραδεδομένοις); but it is found in that which is called the gospel according to the Egyptians."

[1] Tertul. adv. Marcion, Lib. v. chap. 42. See, too, Epiph. Hæres. 42, 9.
[2] Epiph. Hæres. 42, 9, p. 310, 373.
[3] Adv. Marcion, tom. v. chap. 42.
[4] Comm. in Ep. ad Philem. prœm. (Opp., tom. iv. p. 442.)
[5] Hist. Ecc., Lib. vi. chap. 14.
[6] Strom. Lib. iii. p. 465; edit. of Paris, 1629.

He always places both Testaments in the same rank, as the word of God. Thus in his second book of the Stromata [1] he says, "The man justified by faith shall live by that faith which is according to the Testament and the Commandments; for these two testaments which are two as to name and date, having been given by a wise economy according to the age and its wants, are only one in their power (δυνάμει μία οὖσαι). Both the Old Testament and the New are equally bestowed through the Son, by one and the same God." He also calls the collection of the canon, the "gospel of the Apostle," "the Lord's writings," "the New Testament."

In the seventh book of the Stromata,[2] he compares them to the Virgin Mary, conceiving the Lord, while remaining a virgin. "Such are the Lord's Scriptures (αἱ κυριακαὶ γραφαι); they conceive the truth and remain virgins, by concealing the mysteries of the truth." He says, "We have, for a principle of doctrine the Lord himself, who leads us in various measures and ways from the beginning to the end of knowledge, whether by means of the Prophets, or the Gospel, or the blessed Apostles." He says again, "Both the Gospel and the Apostle bid us mortify the old man." [3]

It is always to the Scriptures that he appeals against his opponents, as to an inspired book, a universal rule, the only rule of faith, the infallible judge of controversies.

In his seventh book of the Stromata, he says,[4] "They who do not follow God wherever he leads, fall from that elevated state I have described; now God guides by the divinely inspired Scriptures." And again,[5] "When we have overthrown them by showing their evident opposition to the Scriptures, you will see their leaders always doing one of two things: showing contempt either for the consequences of their own doctrines, or for the prophecy itself, or rather for their own hope."

It is to the Scriptures, also, that Clement always appeals.

[1] Page 756, Paris edit. 1629. [2] Page 757. [3] Page 706.
[4] Book vii. 5, 16, chap. xvi. p. 894 (or 761). [5] Page 892.

"We then too, when, in regard to the Scriptures, we give a perfect demonstration drawn from the Scriptures themselves, — we then form our persuasion in a convincing manner by faith."

"For those who, in order to benefit others, give themselves to writing or preaching the word, if it is useful to acquire some other kind of instruction, it is necessary to know the Scriptures of the Lord for the demonstration of what they say." [1] "The truth is found in confirming each of the things demonstrated according to the Scriptures, by the allegation of similar Scriptures." [2]

Clement in his philosophy on Christian *gnosis*, as he calls it, admitted the existence of a certain mystical tradition which Christ gave to four of his apostles only concerning the hidden sense of Scripture, and which has been transmitted only to certain rabbis of the church, to pass from age to age to a certain number of initiated persons, whom he calls *gnostics* or scientific men. And in the mean time, in spite of this system of tradition, sustained by him alone, and strongly combated by both Irenæus and Tertullian,[3] Clement has not ceased to declare that the Scriptures are the universal rule of faith as well for the gnostic, initiated in their profoundest meanings, as for the simple believer. "For the gnostic knows according to the Scripture." [4]

In the seventh book of the "Stromata," he says again,[5] "They are the believers who have only tasted the Scriptures; but they are the *gnostics* who have advanced still farther, and become exact gnomons of the truth; they there discover hidden meanings not perceived by the vulgar."

[1] Strom. Lib. vi. sec. ii. p. 786.

[2] Strom. Lib. vii. sec. xvi. p. 891.

[3] Irenæus adv. Hæres. Lib. i. cap. 242, p. 101; Lib. iii. cap. 14, 15, pp. 235, 237; Tertullian de Præscript., chaps. 8 and 25. The pretense that the apostles had not revealed the same things to all, but had taught certain things in secret and to a small number, he denominates a falsehood.

[4] Strom. Lib. vi. sec. 11.

[5] Sec. 16, p. 891; Edit. Potter, Oxford, 1715, p. 757. Edit. Heinsius, Paris, 1629.

But we pass to the pious Irenæus, still nearer than Clement or Tertullian to the times of the apostles.

Irenæus.

Irenæus, born among the Greeks of Asia about A. D. 120, that is, only seventeen years after the death of John, and in the very place where this apostle finished his course, had received from childhood a Greek and at the same time a Christian education; for he had the happiness, as he says, "when yet an infant," of being frequently with the martyr Polycarp the holy bishop of Smyrna. "This Polycarp," he says,[1] "taught by the apostles and intimate with many of the men who had seen the Lord, and placed by apostles over the province of Asia as bishop of Smyrna, we have seen in our infancy, teaching all the things he had learned of the apostles." — And now see what he wrote about him still later in the interesting fragment of his works which comes to us through Eusebius.[2]

"O Florinus, these impious dogmas (of the gnostics) are not those taught you by them who were disciples of the apostles; for I have seen thee, while I was yet an infant, in Asia Minor near Polycarp, whilst thou wert still shining at the imperial court and seeking to be agreeable to it. I remember better what passed at that time than more recently; for the things learned in childhood take root in the soul. I could describe both the place where this blessed Polycarp was sitting, and his manner of entering and of retiring, his mode of life, his appearance, his discourses to the people, his familiar relations with John, and with those who had seen the Lord, and how he used to repeat their discourses and all they had said to him about the Lord, his miracles and his doctrine. Now these things which Polycarp used to state were all in accordance with the Scriptures. By the goodness of God, I even then listened attentively to them, recording their

[1] Hæres. Lib. iii. chap. 3. [2] Hist. Eccl. Lib. v. chaps. 19, 20.

words, not on paper, but in my heart; and by the grace of God, I can accurately run over them in my memory."

We have not shrunk from dwelling on these long details, because they show how near to the very origin of Christianity these testimonies began to be uttered. Irenæus even informs us that he lived in a period when you could still meet with men having the *charisms* or miraculous powers received from the imposition of the apostles' hands.[1] He says, "We ourselves have heard in the Church many brethren who had prophetic gifts, and who spoke various languages by the Holy Spirit."[2]

We see in his books[3] that he had at the same time studied the literature and philosophy of his times. Tertullian calls him "a zealous explorer of all knowledge."[4] He had thoroughly learned the Celtic language, to become more useful as a preacher of the gospel, and he spoke it habitually. Thus, at the commencement of his book[5] he excuses himself for having neither the habit of writing nor the elegancies of language; "because, living among the Celts, I am obliged to converse generally in a barbarous tongue."

Irenæus was then an eminent man, admired by all the church for his missionary zeal, as well as his wisdom and charity. He had first preached the gospel to the pagans; and it is said to have been by the advice of Polycarp that he left Smyrna with Pothinus to go and preach the Word to the Gauls, and soon to take charge, at the peril of his life, of the church just formed amidst the idolatrous people of Lyons. In A. D. 178, when Pothinus, who was much older than he, (being born fifteen years before the death of John,) had suffered martyrdom with so many other believers of

[1] Acts viii. 17.

[2] Euseb., H. E., v. 7. See also in Iren. Hæres. Lib. v. chap. 6.

[3] See his quotations from the ancient poets and philosophers, particularly in chap. 19 of his Book ii.

[4] Or *of all doctrines*, doctrinarum omnium curiosissimus explorator. Contra Valentinianos, cap. v.

[5] P. 3, Grabe, Oxf. 1702.

Lyons, Irenæus succeeded him in his charge of bishop, and afterwards also in his prison; for they decapitated him under Septimus Severus, some say, A. D. 197, after the bloody victory of this Emperor at the gates of Lyons; others say, in A. D. 202, at the time of the general persecution. Irenæus, A. D. 177, during the captivity of Pothinus, had been deputed by the churches of Gaul to visit the Asiatic bishops and the bishop of Rome (Eleutherus). He had afterward to reprimand the successor of the latter for his intolerance. "So far," he said, "as one has it in his power to do good to his neighbor, and refuses to do it, he must be held as a stranger to the love of the Lord." [1]

All his ministry was a blessing to the Gallic churches as well as the general cause of truth. "He was the illuminator (φωστήρ) of the Galatians (Gauls) of the West," says Theodoret. He had written commentaries and many other works, but almost all has perished except his work "Against the Heresies," written particularly against the Valentinians, who had penetrated in his day from Rome into Gaul, perverting the faith of a great number, especially women. Irenæus composed this great work carefully. Only brief fragments of the original Greek are found; but the entire work is preserved to us in a Latin translation bearing the date A. D. 1400.[2]

Let any one then take up the folio volume of Irenæus, and open it at random anywhere, excepting in the first pages devoted to the exposition of Valentinian gnosticism and its impious fantasies; (of his thirty æons, of Mother Achamoth or the thirtieth æon, and the substances produced by her,) we venture to say that it will be rare to find a page on which our Scriptures are not quoted. We know no modern author

[1] Fragments of his letter to Victor, in the Works of Irenæus, p. 466, Grabe's edition, 1702.

[2] We generally quote from Grabe's edition, large folio, Oxford, 1702, which is the best. Others recommend that of the Benedictines of Massuet, Paris, folio, 1710. We have sometimes employed it.

who has made so constant a use of them. And the reader, in view of such a book, will be soon constrained to recognize that the Christian people of the second century were, as to their knowledge and their interest in the Scriptures, superior to the Christian people of the nineteenth.

From the first page you will discover what is the character of the whole book in this respect. Already the first line of the preface quotes the first epistle of Paul to Timothy: "Considering, that certain persons sent among you to attack the truth, introduce, as the Apostle says, words of falsehood and 'endless genealogies, which minister questions rather than godly edifying, which is in faith,' leading the simple astray, falsifying *the oracles of the Lord* (τά λόγια Κυρίου) and perverting many, (2 Tim. xi. 18,) after having led them, under a vain pretense of science (*gnosis*), far from Him who has created and arranged the universe; as if they had something better or greater to show them. . . . . I have thought necessary, beloved, after having read the commentaries of the followers of Valentinus, (as they call themselves,) to acquaint thee with these monstrous mysteries; that thou mayest speak of them to those around thee, and that thou mayest exhort them to keep themselves from these depths of folly and from this blasphemy against Christ."

And if from these first lines you pass to the last, you will still have some glimpse of the abundant, indeed I should say the exuberant, quotations of our Holy Books which are made by this bishop of the second century. Open at the beautiful chapter xxxvi., in which he describes the scenes of the last day. This chapter contains only fifty-four lines; and yet he has there found room to quote at length, besides two books of the Old Testament, (Ex. xxxv. 40, and Isa. lxvi. 32,) twelve passages of the New. To convey some idea of it, I will quote the last thirty lines:[1]

"Then, as the ministers of the Word teach us, 'they who

1 Translating from their obscure and antique Latin, as the Greek is lost.

shall have been counted worthy[1] to inhabit heaven shall be carried thither, some to taste there the delights of paradise; others to partake of the glory of the celestial city. In each place they will see God; but they will see him in proportion to their knowledge of him here; for in this blessed abode of heaven there will be a proportionate degree of separation from God, according as they may have brought forth fruit: some a hundred, some sixty, some thirty.' (Matt. xiii. 8, and Mark iv. 8.) And it is in view of this that THE LORD HAS SAID, 'In my Father's house are many mansions.' (John xiv. 2.) All these joys in fact shall come to them from God, who assigns to each his appropriate residence. It is therefore his Word[2] has said, that the Father distributes to every one according as he is worthy. And that is this *triclinium*, this table at which are seated the guests who are to partake of the wedding feast (Matt. xxii. 2; Luke xiv. 16); for the ministers of the Word, disciples of the Apostles, tell us that such is the law of coördination (adordinationem) by which the redeemed will be ranked. They are thus advanced by degrees, rising by the Spirit to the Son, and by the Son to the Father; the Son at length yielding his work to the Father, AS THE APOSTLE HAS SAID (1 Cor. xv. 25, 26): He must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death, for in the time of this kingdom the just man shall no more know[3] on earth what it is to die. Yet, THE APOSTLE ADDS, when he saith, all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all. For this reason John foretold a first resurrection of the just (Rev. xx. 5) and an inheritance of a kingdom on the earth (Rev. v. 10). For this reason

[1] Or, *judged worthy* (καταξιωθέντες). It is the very expression of Luke xx. 35; xxi. 36.

[2] Verbum ejus.

[3] Obliviscetur.

the PROPHETS also, in the harmony of their revelations (concordantes), have predicted it; and it is this, too, WHICH THE LORD HIMSELF TEACHES, when he promises to his disciples the new cup which he will drink with them in his Father's kingdom (Matt. xxvi. 29). Thus THE APOSTLE declares that the time shall come when the creature shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God (Rom. viii. 21.) In all and by all these revelations, one and the same God and Father is showed to us who formed man by his hands (qui plasmavit hominem), who promised to the fathers the heritage of the earth, who dispenses it to them in the resurrection of the just, and who, fulfilling thus the promises which he has made to them for the kingdom of his Son, accomplishes finally the things which eye has not seen, nor ear heard, nor have entered into the heart of man (1 Cor. ii. 9). Thus, then, there is an only Son, who has perfectly fulfilled the will of the Father, and one only human race in which are consummated the mysteries of God, mysteries into which the angels desire to look (1 Pet. i. 12), although it is impossible for them to find out to perfection the wisdom of God by which is completed that creature he has formed with his hands (plasma ejus), to be made conformable to the Son, and of the same body with him (concorporatum Filio); in order that his first begotten, the Word, may descend into his creature formed by his hands, that it may be received by him (capiatur ab eo), and that in its turn the creature may receive the Word, rise up to it, rise above the angels and be made in the image and likeness of God."

Such, then, was Irenæus, and such was the canon in his time. All our Scriptures abound in his books — the four Gospels, the Acts, the Epistles, the Apocalypse.

And first, as to the four Gospels, Irenæus quotes them constantly; and what will show us how deeply, in days so near the time of the Apostles, the use of them, and the use of four exclusively, had rooted itself in the thought of the

church, it is not only that Irenæus has written a long chapter[1] entitled, "Proof of there being four and only four Gospels;" and it is not only that always regarding them as one indivisible whole, he has for that reason called them "*the Gospel under four forms;*" he even goes so far as to seek for this quadruple form mystical reasons, which, while valueless in our eyes, none the less strongly attest the conviction of Irenæus, and of his age. As Olshausen says,[2] in order that Irenæus should so express himself to the men of his epoch concerning the four Gospels, it must have been that the church then existing knew no period when she had not had them. Irenæus compares the *quadriform gospel* (τετράμορφον) to the four quarters of the globe, to the four universal spirits, to the cherubim with four faces, etc. "The church is scattered over the earth; but the pillar and ground of the church is the gospel and the spirit of life. It was then proper that it should have four pillars, promoting purity and quickening humanity. And hence it is manifest that the Word, creator of all things, who is seated on the cherubim, and who sustains all things, when he proposed to make himself known to men, chose to give us the gospel under a quadruple form, while at the same time it is sustained in unity by one only and identical Spirit.[3] Now we have showed by very many and very powerful reasons, on the one hand, that there are not more than four, and on the other, that there are not less; because they alone are true and solid (quoniam sola illa vera et firma)."

He adds, "Matters being thus, very vain and very ignorant, yes, very audacious are all they who would change this form (ἰδέαν) of the gospel, and give it more or less than these four visages. And so great in respect to the gospels is this firmness of which we are speaking, that the heretics them-

[1] Lib. iii. chap. 2, sec. 7.

[2] Ächtheit d. 4 Ev. sec. 272.

[3] It is the 9th chap. of Book iii. in the Massuet Bened. edit. 1710; the 11th, in Grabe's Oxford edit. 1702, pp. 214, 221.

selves[1] render it their testimony, and that you see every one of them, when he comes forth to daylight, supporting his positions by these very gospels."

And what we affirm concerning the persuasion of Irenæus and his age as to the four gospels, is not less true as regards the book of Acts. He cites it more than sixty-four times, and even labors in his third book to show by numerous citations the harmony of this book of Luke with the epistles of Paul.

Nor is this persuasion less in regard to the other books of the canon. He quotes also abundantly from them. We have, for instance, counted in the index of Grabe[2] a hundred and seven quotations which Irenæus has made from the first epistle to the Corinthians, eighty-eight from the epistle to the Romans, thirty-four from the Ephesians, twenty-nine from the Galatians, twenty from Colossians, eighteen from second Corinthians, eleven from Philippians, eleven from first Peter, ten from second Thessalonians, five from first Timothy, four from second Timothy, three from Titus, three from first John, and two from first Thessalonians. In a word, he quotes *all* the books of the Canon. He omits only the letter to Philemon. Are we surprised? This brief epistle, treating only of a question of domestic morals, and having nothing dogmatic in it, had no chance of being quoted in a book of controversy; and we have said elsewhere that at the same time Tertullian mentioned it in Africa, and that it was not until the audacious Marcion that any one questioned its authenticity.[3]

This testimony of Irenæus to the canon of the second century is, then, irrefragable; but, to render it complete, we must still show, by a few quotations selected from the multitude in his book, how firm was the faith of that age in the divine inspiration of all these books, their sufficiency and their au-

1 He says, the Ebionites, Marcion, Marcus, and Valentinus.

2 P. 473. And we know Grabe has frequently omitted passages.

3 Canon, chap. 2, sec. 3.

thority. The passages which prove it are so numerous in the course of his book that we are embarrassed in selecting. Everywhere with him it belongs to the Scriptures to lay the foundation of faith, reëstablish it in overthrowing error, to be its sole, universal and divine rule; and it is always, as Erasmus says,[1] "by the garrisons of Scripture alone that Irenæus attacks the squadrons of the heretics."

"In employing[2] these proofs which are taken from the Scriptures, you easily overthrow, as we have showed, all these sentences of the heretics afterward invented."

The collection of our Scriptures was already called the New Testament; and everywhere Irenæus places them in the same rank of authority with those of Moses and the prophets.

"The precepts of perfect life," he says in the fourth book,[3] "being the same *in both Testaments*, have revealed to us the same God."

In his first book, Irenæus exposes the doctrines of Valentinus and his acolytes; in the second, he shows their evil character; in the third, he refutes them by the Scriptures. "We have learned the plan of salvation only by those who have brought us the gospel. They first proclaimed it by their voices; then they left us the tradition of it in the Scriptures by the will of God, to be after them the pillar and ground of the faith."

He says again,[4] "In opposing the sound doctrine to the contradictions of heretics, following only one teacher, the only and true God, and having his words for the rule of truth, we all and always say the same things on the same points." — And again: "If we can not find solutions for everything we meet in the Scriptures, we ought to resign those questions to God, who also hath created us; knowing that the Scriptures

[1] Præf. in Irenæum.

[2] Chap. xiv. p. 422; Grabe's edit. 1702.

[3] It is chap. xii. Bened. edit. Paris, 1710; it is the xxvith in that of Grabe, Oxford, 1702, p. 312.

[4] Lib. iv. chap. 69, Grabe, Oxford, p. 368.

are certainly perfect, because they were spoken by the Word of God and his Spirit."[1]

In all the course of his five books you meet expressions like these: "We prove by the Scriptures; as we learn from the Scriptures; we have proved from the Scriptures; we have demonstrated by the Lord's Scriptures; we must explain everything that lies in the Scriptures; if they had known the Scriptures, they would have known . . . ; let us return to the proof which is drawn from the Scriptures; having for ourselves these proofs which are drawn from the Scriptures. — Firm, real, not imaginary, alone true, is the faith which we sustain; this faith receiving from the Scriptures a manifest demonstration."

He says elsewhere: "John wishing to establish a rule of truth in the church, has thus spoken."

"When we have refuted them by the Scriptures," he says of the heretics, "they turn and question the Scriptures themselves as if they erred or expressed themselves erroneously, or lacked authority, or had divers senses, or were insufficient for the discovery of truth for those who have not tradition; because, they say, the truth was not given by writing, but by the living voice."

At the same time, before passing further, we must notice those passages in which this father appeals to apostolical tradition, and from which the doctors of Rome have derived the sanction of their views of tradition. It is easy to see that Irenæus had in view a totally different matter. He never means by this term, as they do at Rome, an oral transmission, apocryphal and continued, no one knows by whom, of dogmas not contained in the Scriptures, or of dogmas even opposed to its teachings. On the contrary, with him as with all the other fathers, this term is employed most commonly *to designate the Scriptures.* We have just quoted his words: "The apostles, after having preached the gospel with the living voice, have left us by the Divine will the tradition of it in

[1] Lib. ii. chap. 47, p. 173; Grabe, 1702.

the Scriptures, (Evangelium . . postea per voluntatem Dei in Scripturis nobis *tradiderunt*), to be after them the pillar and ground of faith." The Scriptures, — that is Irenæus' tradition, the true tradition, "given by the will of God to be after them the pillar and ground of faith."

"This interpretation of which we speak, agrees with the tradition of the apostles," he says:[1] "for Peter and John and Matthew and Paul and others have thus spoken. In fact, the same spirit of God which has spoken in the prophets, has also announced in the apostles the fullness of times and the approach of the kingdom of heaven."

"The Fathers," remarks the learned Mr. Goode, in his Divine Rule,[2] (speaking of Irenæus and especially of his followers,) "constantly employ the terms *tradition* and *apostolical tradition* to designate *the Scriptures;* and it is by a strange abuse that Messrs. Newman and Keble cite them to sustain the meaning totally different given to this expression by the doctors of Rome." Mr. Goode even shows that the passages of Athanasius alleged by these authors as favoring tradition in the Roman sense, say precisely the contrary, and recommend only the written Word. It may be seen by numerous quotations from Irenæus, Athanasius, Gregory Nazianzen, Cyril of Alexandria, Socrates the historian, Cyprian, and even Jerome, that, by *evangelical tradition*, the Fathers meant the gospels, as distinct from the Acts and Epistles; and by *apostolical tradition*, the Acts and Epistles of the apostles.

It is very true that Irenæus, with the other fathers, also sometimes uses this expression to designate a still recent recollection of the apostles and their teachings, which was preserved in those places where they had labored; but even then he employs it still in a sense totally opposed to that of the Roman doctors. The heretics, confounded by the quotations from the Scriptures, produced the traditions of the

[1] Lib. iii. chap. 25, p. 256; Grabe, 1702.
[2] London, 1853, vol. i. p. 68.

apostles to sanction their errors, and pretended to appeal from the written to the oral testimony of these men of God. Irenæus, to refute them, himself urged an appeal to the still accessible tradition of the apostles; that is, to the recollection still preserved in his time among the churches which they had founded. Nothing was more rational. If in our days, for example, one should affirm some historical falsehood concerning the passage of the Alps by Bonaparte, fifty or sixty years ago, in his campaign of Marengo; and if the authors of the falsehood, rejecting the testimony of books, should appeal from it to the oral traditions gathered in those places, we might with Irenæus, accept the challenge; we might oppose with confidence this source of information to their statements, and defy them to find in it any trustworthy support of those statements. But if, instead of Napoleon, the question was about Hannibal; and if instead of the passage of the Alps by the French, it referred to that by the Carthaginians more than two thousand years ago, we should scarcely be so absurd as to refer to local traditions, which could be of no value in the case. It was so with Irenæus.

He never dreamed of a tradition perpetual, infallible, transmitted from generation to generation, no one knows how. But when the Valentinians, incapable of resisting his arguments, pretended to set against them the oral instruction of the apostles, he replied, "We know it better than you, and we can easily find this teaching in the churches founded by them." They were then only in the second century of Christianity; they still preserved the living remembrance of the succession of bishops after the apostles; they still found in many places, as Irenæus affirms, "men endowed with charisms or miraculous powers received from some apostle, or even old believers who had conversed with the immediate disciples of Jesus Christ." It was then quite legitimate for this father to appeal to such reminiscences. He exclaims at the beginning of his third book,[1] in complaining of the

[1] Chap. II., p. 200. Grabe, 1702.

Gnostics and their bad faith: "O dearly beloved, see the men with whom we have to contend! They slip away from all our proofs like snakes; and will submit to neither scripture nor tradition. Thus in all the church, men who desire to know the truth, may recognize *the tradition of the apostles* rendered manifest in all the world. We have only to count the bishops ordained by them in divers churches, and their successors to our day. They have never taught or known anything like the absurdities which these doctors deliriously utter." And in the two following chapters,[1] Irenæus still is seeking to confound his adversaries, the Marcionites and Valentinians, by this very testimony which they had the audacity to invoke: in the first, which he entitles "Of the succession of bishops from the apostles;" and in the second, entitled, "Testimony of those who saw the apostles, as to the preaching of the truth."

We see then that Irenæus in the second century referred to a tradition, recent and traceable; (veterem traditionem apostolorum) but not to one modern, apocryphal and of unknown origin, such as the Roman bishops invoke after seventeen centuries have passed away. It was with him a tradition human and fallible, although well informed; not one self-styled divine and infallible, although very defectively informed, such as that which the Council of Trent has pretended to place on the level of the Scriptures,[2] and even above them.[3]

But further, these very recollections of the apostles still discoverable in local traditions, Irenæus, however much he respected them, never ceased to subject to the control of the Holy Scripture. He never admits that any tradition, however early it may be, can teach what the written Word does not teach. And in that famous letter to Florinus which we have already quoted,[4] you see that as soon as he has quoted

[1] III. & IV. p. 200, 205, Oxford edit. 1706.
[2] Pari pietatis et reverentiæ affectu (Session 4, first decree).
[3] Ibid. second decree of April 28, 1546.
[4] Canon, chap. II., sec. 5.

Polycarp's reminiscences of John, and John's remarks on Christ, he takes care to add that they were "all *conformed to the Scriptures* (πάντα σύμφωνα ταῖς γραφαῖς). So sensitive was his holy jealousy for the sovereignty of the written Word.

"Having then for our rule," he says in his second book,[1] "the very truth and the testimony of God fully revealed, we ought not to reject the firm and true knowledge of God by permitting ourselves to go and seek for other solutions of the questions, here and there. If we can not find the reply to all the difficult questions which the Scriptures suggest, . . . we must commit them to God who also created us; knowing fully *that the Scriptures* are perfect, because they were spoken by the Word of God and by his Spirit."

"It is thus that by using these proofs which *are derived from the Scriptures*, you easily overthrow all those false notions of the heretics which have been more recently imagined."

"And if any one asks,[2] Before God created the world what was he doing? we will reply that is for God to answer. For the Scriptures teach us that this world, created perfect, began in time; but what God was doing before that, no Scripture informs us. It is then a question which belongs only to God, and which we must leave to his sovereign disposal."

And to sum up all, Irenæus declares that the Valentinians, in building on traditions not contained in the Scriptures, spin ropes of sand. "When they do this," says he, "and advance what is not taught by the prophets, the Lord Jesus, nor the apostles, pretending to know more than other Christians, and making allegations which are not taken from that which is written; they but spin, as it is said, ropes from sand."[3] (ἐξ ἄμμου σχοινία πλέκειν ἐπιτηδεύοντες.)

[1] Chap. 67, p. 173. Oxford edit., 1702.
[2] Lib. ii., chap. 47, p. 175.
[3] Lib. i., chap. 1, sec. 15. Oxford edit., 1702.

Other Cotemporary Fathers.

Such then was Irenæus; such were Clement and Tertullian; such, the latter half of the second century in the east and the west, and such its canon. But if we have deemed it best to cite more abundantly these three illustrious fathers on account of the immense weight of their testimony, it is not that we could not find others of the same period, of whose writings we retain fragments or extracts in Eusebius. W refer to Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, converted A. D. 150, and author of an apology still in existence; to Athenagoras, an Athenian philosopher converted to Christianity, and flourishing A. D. 177; to Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, about A. D. 170, and martyred in 178; and finally to Asterius Urbanus, bishop or teacher of the Galatian churches, who preached with power in the city of Ancyra about A. D. 188.

Dionsysius of Corinth, Eusebius says (Hist. Eccl. IV. 23), complains that having written some letters, "there were ministers of Satan who had changed them. But should I be astonished, since some have even ventured to falsify the very *Scriptures of the Lord!*" It is thus he refers to the New Testament.

Asterius Urbanus wrote, according to Eusebius;[1] three books against the Montanists. "I hesitated for a long time to publish them; not that I doubted about the duty of rendering testimony to the truth, but from the fear of appearing in some measure to go beyond what is written, and to decide something beyond the *Word of the New Testament of the Gospel*, from which nothing must be taken, to which nothing must be added, when one has resolved to govern his life by that gospel." Thus spoke this teacher in Galatia, nearly a century after Paul. He not only wished to govern his life by the word of the New Testament, but he admitted no other tradition of Jesus Christ and his apostles.

Athenagoras, although less called by the nature of his

[1] Hist. Ecc. Lib. v. chap. 16. Reading edit., vol. 1.

writings to quote the Scriptures, presents us also himself many passages borrowed either from the gospels or the epistles. He says, for example, in a treatise on the resurrection of the dead, (pages 61, 62,) "This mortal must, according to the apostle, put on immortality, in order that the dead being restored to life by the resurrection . . . every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad."

Theophilus of Antioch is still more definite. Converted, it is said, in mature life by the power of the Scriptures, A. D. 150, he had composed, as Jerome tells us, Commentaries on the four Gospels,[1] books against Marcion and Hermogenes, and catechisms now entirely lost. But we may produce here numerous passages from the "Apologetic Treatise," which he addressed in three books to his old friend Autolycus, still a pagan and violently opposed to Christianity. He there frequently quotes both the gospels and Epistles, but referring to them in general terms, as should be done in dealings with pagans. We give some examples.

See how, among others, he recommends to Autolycus [2] the inspiration of the Old and the New Testaments. "Now, as to the justice of which the law has spoken, we find analogous things both in the Prophets and the Evangelists; because all the inspired men (*πνευματοφόρους*) have spoken by one only and the same Spirit of God."

See too how he quotes the fifth chapter of Matthew, "Now THE EVANGELICAL VOICE recommends chastity still more forcibly when it says, Whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, etc. And whosoever shall marry her that is divorced, committeth adultery, etc. And still further, in regard to charity, the *Evangelical History says*, Love your enemies, pray for them who persecute you, etc. — and as respects humility, the *Gospel* says, Let not thy right hand know," etc.

And see, moreover, how he quotes the epistle to the Ro-

1 Letter to Algasius (tom. iv. p. 197; Bâle, 1537.) See Prœm in Matt.
2 Lib. iii. p. 126.

mans (xiii. 7, 8) : " *The Divine Wisdom* (Divina Sapientia in the Latin version) requires us to render to all their dues ; tribute to whom tribute, custom to whom custom, honor to whom honor, fear to whom fear, and to owe no man anything, but to love them all." And the first to Timothy (ii. 2) ; " Besides that *Our Divine Word*, as to our duty to magistrates, ordains even that we should pray for them, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life." And in his second book, speaking of the body of inspired Scriptures and of John's gospel :[1] " Behold what *the Holy Scriptures* teach and all the *pneumatophoric men* (spirit-bearing) of whom was John who said, " In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was God," etc.

Such was the second century in its latter half, and such the firmness of its faith in the first canon.

What shall we then conclude from all these testimonies so unanimous and so powerful which speak at once from Antioch, Galatia, Macedonia, Carthage, and Gaul ?

Conclusion from all these Testimonies.

We must first fully perceive that these quotations not only express the unanimous personal persuasion of all those great teachers, so different in their positions, characters, and nationalities ; not only even the faith of the cotemporary church ; not only " the very great firmness " as Irenæus terms it of this faith in the four gospels ; its very great firmness in regard to the book of Acts and the thirteen Pauline epistles, as also the two epistles of Peter and John ; but they also especially show with a resistless power, the historical legitimacy of this faith ; the origin, necessarily apostolical, of all these twenty books, and their perfect and incontestable authenticity. And this proof is so powerful, that it might, we think, suffice of itself even if we had no other, either preceding or succeeding it.

[1] Lib. ii. p. 100.

In fact let us go back in imagination to the epoch so near the time of the apostles when these fathers were living, and inquire how, if the unanimity of all the churches in regard to the twenty books had not commenced in the apostles' time, it would have been possible that, only fifty years after the death of John, a conviction so perfectly unanimous, so calm and so sure of itself could, in so short a period, have entirely pervaded Christendom. Who otherwise can explain this vast phenomenon? Who can say by what other process this persuasion could have been formed from one end of the empire to the other; formed among the Latins as among the Greeks, among the Celts as among the Syrians; formed in such a way that these books were not only everywhere received as inspired, but everywhere received without question, everywhere with an acknowledgment of the same authors (although then without their names attached to them as now,) everywhere with the same order of arrangement in the canon; everywhere four gospels, "no less, no more," says Irenæus; everywhere, Matthew first, then Mark, then Luke, then John; and everywhere attributing the first and fourth to apostles, the second and the third to inspired men who were not apostles, whilst no index designated the authors in any one of the three synoptical gospels; everywhere the book of Acts attributed to Luke; then everywhere the thirteen epistles of Paul, always classed in the same order, which was by no means their chronological order; everywhere the epistle first in order, that to the Romans, then Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, Philemon; then the first epistle of Peter and the first of John; (for, as we have affirmed before, these twenty books have never changed their respective places;[1]) that one of these three letters which was written from Babylon having made its regular way among the churches of Africa or of Gaul to take its own

[1] Some have placed the Acts after the Epistles, and some others, the catholic letters before the thirteen letters of Paul; but these moreover, have always, with the four gospels, preserved their respective order.

rank, as well as the letters sent from the prisons of Rome, had made their way among the Greek churches of Egypt or the Syriac churches of Adiabene.

How then can any one account for this unanimity at once so peaceful and so firm in regard to the twenty books, unless by admitting the only reasonable explanation which is possible, I mean the recognition in this universal agreement of a concert, commenced during the life of the apostles, and extending without opposition under their influence into every part of the world where the church existed? This results moreover naturally, as already remarked, from the fact that the apostles had presided over the innumerable churches founded by them for more than thirty years; some longer still, and John for seventy years. Without this explanation, which harmonizes all the facts in the case, how can we explain the fact that in the short space of a half century, any one of the twenty books of the canon had come, without any opposition, to be received everywhere, by all the ministers, by all the bishops, by all the churches; everywhere in the same order in the canon; everywhere by silent consent; everywhere at least without leaving in the church one sign of remonstrance? — and that also, among believers such as were the Christians of the second century; among teachers, influential, learned, dwelling in the East and the West, vigilant, zealous, ready for martyrdom; among men even so jealous of the smallest apostolical reminiscences that you see them at the same time holding councils and coming near separating[1] the East from the West, for what? for an insignificant difference as to the day of Easter; the one party having learned from their ancestors to celebrate it, as the Jews, on the fourteenth day of March moon; the others having learned from theirs in the West, to defer it to the following Sunday? — a dispute in which Victor was so vehement that Irenæus

[1] Eusebius, H. E. Lib. v. chap. 23. See what he says of Irenæus, Polycrates, Palmas, Victor, Bacchylus.

was obliged to exercise his pious wisdom, and many other bishops to sharply enjoin him to change his language.[1]

Has there ever been seen in the church a concert so suddenly originating, and so perfect in regard to a point of such importance as the apostolical authenticity of twenty sacred books? Would it be easy in our days to deceive all Europe in regard to the works which she has agreed to ascribe to men who died only in 1800 — Lavater, De Saussure, Mallet-Dupan, Kant, Necker, Blair, or Klopstock? Could any one make us receive without remonstrance these new books unknown to their cotemporaries, unknown to all the world to this day? Could any make us readily receive, and without discussion, in literature, apocryphal works of Voltaire or Rousseau, dead now more than eighty years? And yet the world is to-day very slightly interested in deciding the legitimacy of the books ascribed to such men; whereas in the times of Irenæus and Tertullian, all the churches, all the Christians of the world were deeply solicitous for the sacred books; to them the question concerned the Word of life; they would willingly shed their blood to confess it or defend it.

Nor let any one imagine that he can oppose to this incomparable unanimity of the second century, concerning the canon, that of the Roman Church in our day on all those dogmas which separate it from evangelical Christianity. Do we not know what a noise every one of these heresies made in the world before it could be foisted in? Do we not know that councils and popes had to agitate kingdoms by protracted wars before they could make them introduce first, the worship of images, the invocation of the dead, then the celibacy of the clergy, the subordination of bishops, the removal of the cup in the Lord's Supper, and transubstantiation? And even in our day, do we not know that it is only after ages of fierce disputations that Rome has been able to proclaim her dogma

[1] Socrates, H. E. Lib. v. chap. 22. This controversy was not settled until thirty years later at the Council of Nice.

of the immaculate conception?[1] How different it was in the second century with the unanimity of the churches on the first canon! You then find in all Christendom not the faintest trace of a controversy on this subject, either in the East or the West; and you know that one hundred and fifty years afterward, when Eusebius called the twenty-two books of the first and second-first canons, *homologomens*, he intended to say that those Scriptures had never been anywhere disputed, while in speaking of the five shorter and later epistles, he called them *antilegomens*, to show that, while accepted by the majority, they were still questioned by some. But when he looked back to the farthest horizon of history, he could not find the slightest vestige of opposition to the twenty-two homologomens.

We have here, then, the right to demand how this universal agreement is to be explained, if it is not by acknowledging that these books had been already received by all the churches before the apostles finished their career. Without this, what a prodigious influence on the one side and imbecility on the other would have been necessary in order that any one of the four gospels or the book of the Acts, or any one of the fifteen apostolical epistles, should take its present position in the canon of every church without a breath of opposition. In fact, this double miracle of skill and of stupidity would far surpass in improbability all the legends of the Middle Ages, and would require in the adversaries more credulity than the gospel proposes to believers, to make them admit that our holy books were given by the Holy Spirit sent from heaven.

To say that, from the death of John, the Christians of the whole world had received, as apostolical, books which the apostles had not given them; had, without examination, received them from one end of the empire to the other, and caused them everywhere to be publicly read; had caused

[1] See the learned work recently published on this subject by L. Durand, Brussels, 1859

even the apostolical churches of Rome, Corinth, Ephesus, Philippi, Thessalonica, and Galatia to receive them as if they had been given eighty years earlier, while in reality they knew nothing of them through half the second century; — to say that all these churches had agreed to give these new books in the body of the canon a rank everywhere the same, and everywhere invariable; to say that they were all deceived at once and in the same manner, in Egypt, in Gaul, in Greece, in Africa — all brought to the most silent submission in regard to the same books, and even the same names of authors; . . . . in fact this surpasses all the limits of possibility.

Surely, we must all admit, it is not thus that men deceive; and it is not thus men act when they are deceived. So many persons engaged in the paths of falsehood do not reach this universal agreement in a great mass of errors, especially when those errors respect multiplied and specific facts, as that of accepting twenty-two books, attributed to five different authors. The chances of error are diverse among a scattered multitude; and we may here apply to this unanimity what the great Tertullian said in the same century,[1] when, speaking of it in reference to another subject, he exclaimed, "Is it probable that so great a number of churches, and of such important churches, would arrive at one single faith, if all were walking after a falsehood? Among so many persons and such diverse chances the result could not be the same in every case; for when you find among the great number one single and identical thought, it must be that which comes from, not an error, but a tradition."

Let us then conclude, after hearing all these voices of the latter half of the second century, that we must, to be reasonable, simply recognize the fact, (confirmed by so many other considerations,) the only fact which can account for it, to wit, that all the homologomenous Scriptures were already collected before the death of John, and that the Christians of

[1] De Præscript. Hæreticor. cap. xxviii.

the second century held them so firmly only because their predecessors had received them from the apostles.

And let us conclude also that the testimony of the latter half of the second century would suffice of itself to establish the historical certainty of the first canon, that is, the incontestable apostolical authenticity of all the sacred books it contains.

They are the eight ninths of the New Testament; but since almost all these historical proofs belong (as will presently be shown) to the two other books which Eusebius declares to have been always undisputed during the first two centuries of the church, it results that already our proofs attest, by history alone, the authenticity of the thirty-five thirty-sixths of the New Testament.

At the same time we will also furnish new proofs; for our monuments date back still farther and give us witnesses of the first half of the second century and even of the latter years of the first. These will give the hand to the apostolical Fathers, who, with their own eyes, saw the ambassadors of the Lord; and these Fathers in their turn will extend the hand to the apostles who will sometimes speak to us themselves of some of the books of the New Testament.

It will, however, be desirable, before hearing the writers of the first half of the second century, to examine more closely the very remarkable monument which we owe to the researches of Muratori; for it seems to belong to the middle of the second century.

SECTION VI.

THE FRAGMENT CALLED MURATORI'S.

More than a century ago this document was known to the world only through the publication[1] of the celebrated anti-

[1] Antiquit. Ital. Medii Œvi; Milan, 1740.

quarian who discovered it in 1738 in a very ancient Latin manuscript of the Ambrosian library in Milan. But, in these later days, there have appeared three independent editions taken from the original, by Messrs. Nott,[1] Wieseler,[2] and Hertz.[3]

The manuscript itself, in uncial letters and without spaces between the words, presents us an extraordinary specimen of confusion, both by the blunders of the translator, which are enormous, and by those of the editor and copyist, whose sentences appear very frequently to be transposed and abruptly broken off.[4] This state of the manuscript, as well as our ignorance of its precise date, of its author and even of the character of the entire writing (which seems to have been a part of an apologetic dialogue against some cotemporary heretic); all these things united, we have already remarked, forbids our deducing from it very exact conclusions in our history of the canon; but it does not hinder us from regarding the manuscript as a document very worthy of attention on account of its incontestable antiquity.

Muratori attributes it to Caius; Bunsen to Hippolytus; others give it a more recent origin. These are all conjectures; it is enough for us to know that the author calls himself a cotemporary of Pius I., ninth bishop of Rome, from A. D. 142 to 157, and that he must have been younger than the heretics of the second century whose striking testimony we shall soon examine, for he speaks of Marcion, Valentinus, Basilides, and even of the Cataphrygians; wherefore we shall assign him his place here.

It is conceded that the original was in Greek; for this language was then most spoken in the Church of Rome; the language of Paul, of Peter, of Timothy, and of Luke; the

[1] See Reliquiæ Sacræ of Dr. Routh (2d edit., 1846), i. 394.

[2] See Stud. and Kritik, 1847, p. 815, and Ibid. 1856, 1st number.

[3] See Analecta ante-Nicæna of Chev. Bunsen, i., p. 137, etc.

[4] It can not be well judged of but by a personal inspection in Credner's exact copy. Zur Geschichte des Canons, p. 71, etc., 1847. — It will be found also in the Essay of M. Westcott on the Canon, p. 557; Cambridge, 1855.

language of Clement, and of Pius I., as of Justin Martyr, of Hermas, Tatian, Caius, and Hippolytus. It was the language of Irenæus when he wrote from Lyons, though at Lyons he habitually conversed in Celtic.[1] It was also the language of the first liturgies and discourses of the Roman church.[2]

Now this ancient fragment, in its obscure language renders a very clear testimony to our first canon; and we there find, as we shall show, a remarkable enumeration of our sacred books. Although the beginning is lost, and the book commences in the middle of a sentence, you see at once that it shows how the four gospels were given. "The Gospel according to Luke," he says, "is the third" — (these words are there written in red capitals); and the author, from this statement, enters immediately into details on the person of Luke. "The fourth gospel," he adds (again in red ink), "is that of John, one of the disciples." Then follow, on the person of John, new details in which are found these two important declarations.

The first is that, "in the very variety of the instructions of each of the gospels, there is no difference as to the faith of believers (nihil tamen differt credentium fidei); since, in all, by one and the same sovereign Spirit all things are declared concerning the nativity of our Lord, his passion, his resurrection, his interviews with his disciples, and his double advent; the first now passed, in his humiliation; the second, yet to come, in the glory of his regal power." The second declaration is that "John calls himself not only the spectator and hearer, but also the *narrator* of all the wonders of the Lord, since he declares the same things in his epistles (singula etiam in epistolis suis proferat[3]), and since he says in speaking of himself: 'The things which we have seen with

1 Irenæus, Hæres., Lib. i. προοίμιον, p. 3.

2 Bunsen, Hippolytus, ii. 123, (French edition.)

3 The text has *profatam*; but, in these quotations, we, with Bunsen, Hertz, and Wieseler, correct the manifest errors and barbarisms of the text.

our eyes, which our ears have heard, and our hands have handled (palpaverunt), is that which we have written.' "

See then already, on one side, the four gospels proclaimed in this fragment as forming a unity distinct and universally recognized as to their end, their contents and their inspiration. No distinction is made between the authority of the gospels of the two apostles (Matthew and John) and those of the two evangelists (Mark and Luke); they all four have the same authority in the church; they are all the work of one and the same Spirit; no doubt is admitted, none is mentioned. And see, on the other hand, the epistles of John recognized equally as written by the same apostle, to give us the same instructions as his gospel. The fragment even quotes for us the first verse of the first of these epistles.

After the Gospels come the Acts. "Now, the Acts of all the apostles (says the fragment), were written in one single book by Luke, who writes to the excellent Theophilus, recounting to him the events he had witnessed, and therefore relating neither the martyrdom of Peter nor the voyage of Paul into Spain."

Next come the thirteen epistles of Paul. The fragment continues, "Now the epistles of Paul, declare to those who wish to know, from what place and for what reasons they were written."

The author here enumerates them all, but in a different order from the usual arrangement, and manifestly according to the particular motive he imagined the author of each to have had in writing it. "Paul addressed his letters to seven churches, doubling those he wrote to Corinth and Thessalonica. In the mean time, we must remember that there is but one church spread over the entire globe; and therefore John in the Apocalypse, although writing to seven churches, addresses all. But, besides these letters to the seven churches, Paul writes one to Philemon, one to Titus, and two to Timothy."

Let it be noticed here that the fragment has already

brought forward our first canon entire except the first epistle of Peter, which certainly had its place in some other part of this document, as we are to show; and notice too we may say in passing the Apocalypse, and the two lesser epistles of John, and even the catholic epistle of Jude equally recognized.[1]

But the fragment in its disorder now comes to speak of some other books, in its view, spurious. It says, "An epistle to the Laodiceans, is spoken of (fertur etiam), and another to the Alexandrians, invented under the name of Paul to aid the heresy of Marcion, and many others which can not be received in the Catholic church; for it is not seemly to mingle gall with honey." He adds, "The epistle of Jude, however, (sane), and two epistles of John,[2] of which we have spoken above are received into the number of the catholic epistles."

We must carefully remark here that the fragment which places Jude and John among the catholic epistles, at the same time does not preserve their group in its usual place. This group should ordinarily follow either the Acts or the Epistles of Paul. It is universally admitted that the document in its present disordered condition, betrays many transpositions and omissions. This accounts for the fact, that the first catholic epistle of Peter, which was never contested anywhere, and which, with the first of John, makes the nucleus of the catholic epistles of which mention had just been made, is not named here, any more than that of James, while the first of John is mentioned only incidentally and out of its place. This omission is easily explained by the fragmentary condition of the document, in which the connection of the parts is so frequently interrupted.

[1] Mr. Wieseler (Stud. & Krit., 1856), p. 98, thinks that the epistle to the Hebrews was there meant by the words *Alia ad Alexandrinos*. He says the hearers were the Christian Jews of Alexandria.

[2] The Latin having no articles, it may be *two* or *the two* epistles. Mr. Bunsen alone has written *in Catholicis*.

In fact, at this point the pamphlet continues with this strange sentence on the book of Proverbs: "And the wisdom written by the friends of Solomon in honor of him." This phrase, which comes in so unexpectedly to every reader, would be absolutely unintelligible if we could not discover in it, as Mr. Bunsen thinks, a fragmentary allusion to the epistle to the Hebrews, which, like the book of Solomon, must have been written by some friend of Paul, and not by himself.

Finally, the document adds, "We receive only the Apocalypses of John and of Peter; and some among us do not wish the latter to be read in the church."

It is after these words that he mentions, on the one hand, Hermas, and on the other, the principal heretics of the age. "Hermas," he says, "wrote the Shepherd in Rome in our day, while Pius his brother was head of the church of Rome. It must be read, but it can not be published to the people in the church, neither among the prophets, the number of which is complete, nor among the apostles, to the end of time. As to Arsinoüs or Valentinus or Miltiades, we receive absolutely nothing of theirs. Mention too is made of the Psalms attributed to Marcion as well as to Basilides; and as to the head of the Cataphrygians of Asia . . . .

There the fragment is abruptly terminated.

As to these latter details at which we have no desire to pause now, we see clearly the remarkable testimony which this ancient document, however disordered, renders to our first canon.

We now ascend to the first half of the second century.

SECTION VII.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE FATHERS OF THE FIRST HALF OF THE SECOND CENTURY.

We have during this epoch important witnesses to produce; but we should remark that the chronological divisions of those early times were necessarily wanting in precision. It appears to us desirable to classify the witnesses according to the periods of their greatest activity.

Justin Martyr.

If we go back from the middle of the second century toward the end of Trajan's reign (A. D. 117) in passing over the long reigns of Antoninus Pius and Adrian, we come to the most rapid advances of the Gospel, the first general persecutions, the first apologies written to arrest them as also the first great gnostic sects and to the already numerous writings which combated them. This period, so important from its proximity to the beginnings of Christianity, and yet already so harassed by imperial violence without and heresies within, produces numerous writings now lost, letters, chronicles, controversial essays, and especially apologies, all written in Greek. This was therefore called "the period of the Greek apologists." Nearly all these books have perished, and we know scarcely anything either of the writings or writers but by the accounts of Eusebius. If we look over our table of the Fathers (chap. ii. sec. 4,) it will be noticed that if our attention is confined to those born in the second century, and if we reserve the *apostolical Fathers* for a following section, there will remain to be studied scarcely any but Justin Martyr. In fact, although Theophilus of Antioch was born about A. D. 110, we have not been able to place him anywhere but in the latter half of the second century, because he was not converted from paganism until about A. D. 150.

And, on the other hand, we can not summon as witnesses any of the authors cotemporary with Justin, who are mentioned by Eusebius because there is none remaining; neither that Hegesippus who was, after Luke, the earliest ecclesiastical historian; nor that Dionysius of Corinth whose eight letters are mentioned by Eusebius (H. E. iv. 23), and by Jerome (De Script. Illust. cap. 27), and of which we particularly regret to have lost that which he wrote to the church of the Nicomedians against the errors of Marcion, because it certainly would have furnished us abundant quotations from the New Testament; nor that Quadratus, bishop of Athens, who by his apology, presented A. D. 131 to the emperor Adrian, arrested, it is said, the course of the persecution; nor that Aristides, a Christian philosopher of the same city, who had addressed his to the same prince five years before, A. D. 125; nor even, which is still more to be regretted, that Philip, (Euseb. H. E. Lib. iv. 25), bishop of Gortyna, who had also written against Marcion; nor that Agrippa Castor, yet earlier, whom Eusebius calls very distinguished (γνωριμώτατον), and who had composed, he says, twenty-four books on the gospel.[1] The "Skillful Refutation" (ἱκανωτατος ἔλεγχος) published by him, about A. D. 132, against the exegetical books of Basilides, would undoubtedly have furnished us abundant quotations from the Scriptures of the New Testament.[2]

At the same time, we shall have occasion hereafter to say a few more things of those authors now lost; because the fragments which Eusebius has transmitted to us will remarkably confirm, even in their brevity, the testimony of Justin Martyr, and will excite our admiration of the beautiful and strong chain of testimonies which, by connected links, extends without a break from Origen to the apostles.

Nevertheless, if, by the loss of these literary monuments, Justin comes to us in this important epoch as an almost iso-

[1] Lib. iv. chap. 7, etc.; chap. 25.

[2] "Nor many others," we may add with Eusebius (καὶ ἄλλοι δὲ πλείους.)

lated witness, it would be difficult to imagine one better qualified. We will not here repeat our remarks about his testimony on the anagnosis. His career includes the first sixty-seven years of the second century, and more particularly the thirty-four years between his conversion and his martyrdom. The son of a Greek family living in Samaria, Justin was born at Neapolis (Shechem) in the reign of Trajan, in the very year of John the apostle's death (A. D. 103). He lived so near the apostles' days that he witnessed the prophetic charisms or gifts. Thirty years afterward, converted in Egypt from the pagan philosophy of Plato to the living faith of Jesus Christ, he came at the end of seven years to establish himself in Italy, at Rome, upon Mount Viminal, to teach, in a bathing-house, what he called "the Christian philosophy." There, about the year 144, he had the courage to present to the emperor, to his sons and the Roman senate, his first and most valuable "Apology."[1] Afterward, having passed into Asia Minor, he held in the Xysta of Ephesus, with the most celebrated Jew of his day, that apologetic conference which he published under the title of "Dialogue with Trypho the Jew." He returned into Italy to continue his public instructions; and it was A. D. 163 that he published his second Apology, addressed to Marcus Aurelius. At length, four years after this new act of his fidelity, Justin, accused to the præfect of Rome by the malicious Crescens, a cynical philosopher, suffered martyrdom A. D. 167, when Clement of Alexandria was but seventeen years old. He wrote much. Eusebius, (H. E. iv. 18,) who gives us the titles of ten of his works, and who recommends the reading of them to the men of his day, adds that they had been much sought for even by the ancients, and that Irenæus quoted them. Other writings of Justin, not mentioned by Eusebius, were then also in circulation among many of the brethren.

[1] It is *the largest*, which the old editions of Paris (1636) and of Cologne (1686) ordinarily print after the other. The London edition, however, (1722) places it before the other.

Before his conversion he had been an ardent student of the divers systems of philosophy propagated in his day, especially of Platonism; but he did not cease after his conversion to allow to this human wisdom more weight than we think becoming in a minister of the holy Word. We know, too, that through life he preserved the costume and gait of the philosophers. It was a means of recommending himself to the attention of the Greeks, as also of avoiding the violence of a persecuting government. At the same time he blames in his writings the Christians who concealed their faith to save their lives; and he himself did not hesitate to confess it before the governor of Rome. An oriental and a western man, he taught twenty-seven years in Rome, after having made himself personally known in the then most renowned churches of Africa, Europe, and Asia. He had written against the pagans who persecuted the church, the Jews who excited them to it, and the heretics who were then making a bold stand in Rome. He had therefore better means of information than any one else, and he is consequently eminently qualified to stand as the representative of the opinions of his age.

Let us now admire the fullness with which the only three writings of this eminent man remaining to us testify to the Scriptures, and especially to the gospels.

And first, as to the Scriptures in general, he openly and in various forms declares their moral excellence and divine inspiration. We must hear him recount in his "Dialogue with Trypho" his own happy escape from darkness into light! He had long been seeking rest for his soul and the truth of God in all the Grecian philosophies, when he finally met an old man in a solitary place, who entertained him, he says, "with the holy books, written by men who were friends of God, who had spoken by the divine Spirit (θείῳ πνεύματι λαλήσαντες), and who had uttered prophecies still being fulfilled. They alone," he adds, "have seen the truth and have declared it to men, fearing none, seeking not their own glory,

and speaking only the things which they had seen and heard, being filled with the Holy Ghost. . . . . And besides, they were very worthy of belief on account of the miracles which they performed; they glorified the God and Father, Creator of all things, and the Christ his Son whom he had sent. But before all things," added this venerable Christian, "pray that the gates of light may be opened for thee; for these things are not comprehended of all; they are understood only by the men to whom God and his Christ give the knowledge of them." Justin prayed, and the gates of light were opened to him. "Then I found," he says, "that there was the only sure and profitable philosophy. It is thus and by these means that I am a philosopher. And I would, too, that all, entering into the same thoughts, had decided with me no longer to hold themselves aloof from the Saviour's words, for they have in them an inexpressible majesty; they are sufficient to alarm those who turn from the right way, while a very sweet peace becomes the portion of those who meditate them." And still further, when Trypho assures him that he is deceived, he replies, "I will show you, if you will listen, that we have not believed vain fables nor words not susceptible of demonstration (οὐδὲ ἀναποδείκτοις λόγοις), but words full of the divine Spirit, flowing with power and flourishing with grace." Thus he distinctly appeals to the intrinsic excellence of the New Testament as a foundation of our faith in its divinity.

Again, in this same dialogue,[1] Justin, speaking to the Jews of those passages of Scripture which prove the divinity of our Saviour, says, "Attend then to these words which I am going to bring to you from the Holy Scriptures; they need not to be explained, but only heard."

Still further,[2] he speaks of the absurdity of those who imagine themselves capable of producing something better than the Scriptures.

[1] Dial., edit. of Cologne, p. 274. [2] Ibid. pp. 311, 312.

In his "Exhortation to the Gentiles," [1] after having showed how little confidence is to be placed in their philosophies, so contradictory to each other, he describes on the contrary the complete harmony of the sacred writers. "For, having received the knowledge which comes from God, they teach it without dispute and without division. In fact, it is not naturally, nor by human meditation, that men can arrive at the knowledge of such great and divine things, but by a gift which then descended from on high on the holy men of God."

We perceive that it is not to tradition, it is to divine grace, it is to the influence of the Holy Spirit imparted to individuals, that Justin appeals, as the interpreter of the Scriptures. In his Dialogue [2] he exclaims, "O man, think you then that we ever should have found these things in the Scriptures, if, by the will of Him who has chosen to give them, we had not received the grace to understand them?"

And in his "Discourse to the Greeks:" "Come and suffer yourselves to be taught; be as I, for I am also as you!" (These are in Greek the very words of Paul to the Galatians — iv. 12.) "See what has elevated me; it is the internal divinity of the doctrine, and the power of the Word." The divine Word, he exclaimed, "the Word which puts to flight the evil passions, the doctrine which extinguishes the fire in the soul."

In the second place, we have already seen that the books of Justin, only thirty-seven years after the death of John, solemnly attested, in the name of all the cotemporary church, and before the emperor and the Roman senate, the public use which was then made, by all the Christians in the world, of the apostolical Scriptures in their worshiping assemblies.[3] This was in the year 140. Justin had heard them read every Sunday in Rome, in Egypt, in Palestine, in

[1] Edit. of Cologne, p. 9. [2] Idem, p. 346.

[3] Apol. 1st (the large one), sec. 67 (Ed. Bened., Paris, 1742), p. 98, Cologne edit. 1686.

Asia Minor, and in Greece. He says, "They read there the Memoirs of the Apostles, or the Gospels; they read them each Sunday, in the cities and in the rural districts; they read them with the books of the prophets; and in every assembly where they had been read the president (ὁ προεστώς) took the subject of his exhortations from them."

These "Memoirs of the Apostles," of which Justin Martyr speaks three times to the emperor Antonine in his Apology, could not be better indicated to a pagan stranger. We should do the same in our day in a defense of Christianity which we should address to the king of Siam or the Burmese emperor. But Justin took pains to add twice, that these memoirs were *called Gospels*, and were *written* by the apostles. "At that time," he says,[1] "an angel of God, sent to this virgin, announced to her this good news, saying, Behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb by the Holy Spirit, and thou shalt bring forth a son, and he shall be called the Son of the Highest, and thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins, as those have taught us[2] who have written memoirs on all the things which concern our Saviour Jesus Christ, and to which we have given faith."[3] And again, explaining afterward to the same emperor what the Lord's Supper is, he says, "For the apostles, in the memoirs which were composed by them, and *which are called Gospels*,[4] have related to us that Jesus had thus instituted this ordinance; having taken bread and having rendered thanks, he said, Do this in remembrance of me."

Also, in his Dialogue, Justin speaks fifteen times of the Memoirs of the Apostles, but he takes care to repeat ten times that the apostles wrote them. He goes even so far as to make a more precise distinction between those of the gos-

[1] Idem, p. 75, Cologne edit. 1686.

[2] He here combines the narratives of Luke i. 3, and Matt. i. 20, 21.

[3] Ὡς οἱ ἀπομνημονεύσαντες πάντα τὰ περὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐδίδαξαν οἷς ἐπιστεύσαμεν.

[4] ἃ καλεῖται Εὐαγγέλια. This is the common name of these Memoirs among Christians.

pels which had for their authors apostles properly called (as Matthew or John), and those which (such as the two gospels of Luke and Mark) were composed by their companions. "In the Memoirs which I have said were written *by his apostles* and *by those who accompanied them*, (it is written) that the sweat as drops (of blood) came forth from him while he was praying and saying, Let this cup pass from me!"[1] And this distinction which Justin established is so much more worthy of attention since of the many false gospels which were thrown upon the world in the second century, none pretended to be the work "*of one* of the companions of the apostles."

Moreover, the Jew Trypho himself recognized also our gospels; for he says to Justin, "I know (*ἐπίσταμαι*) that even your precepts, contained *in that which is called the Gospel*,[2] are so grand and so admirable that no one can keep them. For I have informed myself carefully of them."[3]

We have entered into such details only to meet the difficulties which in Germany a zealous negative criticism has aimed to raise up against these testimonies of Justin. We shall hereafter quote them.

In the third place, the books of Justin, although addressed, all three, to men hostile to Christianity, present, considering their limited extent, an extraordinary abundance of evangelical quotations. We count more than seventy in his Dialogue, and at least fifty in his Apology. Now these quotations are evidently almost entirely taken from our three synoptical gospels, and relate with much detail the facts of our Saviour's life and death, as also the greater part of his moral teachings. It was his rational task in a defense of Christianity. He had to show to his opponents, in all the

[1] *Ἐν τοῖς ἀπομν . . . ἃ φήμι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκείνοις παρακολουθησάντων συντετάχθαι . . .*

[2] Cologne edit. 1686, p. 227. *Ὑμῶν δὲ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῷ λεγομένῳ εὐαγγελίῳ παραγγέλματα.*

[3] *ἐμοὶ γὰρ ἐμέλησεν ἐντυχεῖν αὐτοῖς.*

facts relating to Christ, the striking fulfillment of the ancient prophecies, and, in the incomparable excellence of his teachings, the divine character of a religion descended from heaven. This guided him in the choice of his quotations. He borrows them almost exclusively, we have said, from our three synoptical gospels: that of John (the spiritual gospel, as it has been called) entering too far into the doctrine of Christ's divinity to be often quoted in an apology addressed to pagans or Jews. Notwithstanding that, many of the expressions of Justin remind us of one who is familiar with John; he even names this apostle and his apocalypse. He says to Trypho, "There is also among us a man named John, one of the apostles of Christ, who, in a *revelation* (an apocalypse) which was made to him, has prophesied that those who shall have believed in our Christ shall pass a thousand years in Jerusalem."[1] But the principal citations of Justin are taken from Matthew and Luke; they are made with freedom, and often at great length. Addressed to pagans and Jews, there was no necessity for literal exactness, if the sense was given. Never, in these one hundred and twenty citations, will you find a single passage which borders on the legend or can be traced to apocryphal gospels. They are all derived from our gospels; he knows only what they know; he relates only what they relate; the infancy of Jesus according to the gospels of Matthew and Luke, his descent from Abraham by Mary;[2] the visit of the angel Gabriel, the accomplishment of Isaiah's prophecy (vii. 14), the vision granted Joseph to prevent his repudiation of his wife, Micah's prediction about Bethlehem, the census, the journey from Nazareth to Bethlehem, Cyrenius, the inn, the stable, the manger, the wise men, their offerings and adorations; the name of "Saviour" given to the holy infant, the flight into Egypt, Jeremiah's prophecy upon the

[1] Ἔπειτα καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν ἀνήρ τις, ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰωάννης . . . ἐν ἀσοκαλύψει γενομένῃ αὐτῷ . . . προεφήτευσε.

[2] Ἐξ ὧν, he says, κατάγει ἡ Μαρία τὸ γένος. Descent, according to him, by Mary. (Dial., chap. 100, 120.)

mourning of Rachel, Archelaus, the return, the thirty years of Jesus, all the history of John the Baptist, the Elijah that was to come, the baptism of Jesus, his temptation in the desert, his miracles of healing, the dance of Herodias's daughter, and the death of the prophet.

Justin, too, in his Dialogue, mentions with no less detail the close of the Lord's career; his triumphant arrival in Jerusalem, fulfilling a prophecy, his entrance into the temple, the institution of the Supper, the singing of the hymn, the three disciples taken aside, the prayers and agony in Gethsemane, the bloody sweat, the arrival of Judas, the flight of the disciples, the silence of Jesus before Pilate, his being sent to Herod, the cross, the casting of lots for his garments, the mockings,[1] the cry of Jesus, his last words, his burial on Friday evening, his resurrection on Sunday,[2] his appearing, his explaining the Scriptures to the apostles,[3] the calumnies of the Jews, the commission given to the apostles, the ascension.

Again, the most abundant quotations of Justin embrace the very teachings of the Saviour. We find there, for instance, almost the entire Sermon on the Mount, his invitations to repentance, his instructions to the seventy disciples, his remarks on the sign of Jonah, on the worth of the soul, on marriage, on tribute to Cæsar, on false teachers, on the resurrection, on chastity, on love to enemies, on the future punishment of the wicked, on the Scribes and Pharisees, on his divinity. "It is written in the Gospel, All things are given to me of my Father; and no man knoweth the Father but the Son, nor the Son but the Father and those to whom the Father hath revealed him."[4]

In his great Apology,[5] to show the admirable morality of the Scriptures, he quotes a large part of the Sermon on the Mount, "If ye love only those who love you, what do ye more than others, for sinners love those who love them?

[1] And also in the Apol. i. chap. 38. [2] Ibid. chap. 69.
[3] Ibid. chap. 50. [4] Dial. p. 326, Paris, 1636. [5] Apol. i. p. 23.

But I say unto you, pray for your enemies, bless those who persecute you . . . ." And on the duty of giving away our goods and doing nothing for our own glory, he adds, "Behold what Jesus has said: Give to them who ask of you, and turn not away. . . . And lay ye not up treasures on earth, where the moth and the rust corrupt. . . . And what will it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"

Besides these extended quotations, we find also in Justin many passages reminding us of the other books of the New Testament. His work as an apologist did not require him to speak of the Acts or the epistles of Paul; but his language often reveals to us incidentally that his spirit has been nourished by them. It is thus that with the epistle to the Colossians (i. 15—17), he calls Jesus Christ four or five times, the "first-born of God," the "first-begotten of all creatures," "he who was before all creatures."[1] It is thus that with the epistle to the Romans he shows that Abraham being yet uncircumcised, was justified by faith, because he believed in God;[2] and it is thus he cites his description of the depravity of all men, both Jew and Greek. "They are all gone out of the way, there is none that doeth good; no, not one; there is none that understandeth; their throat is an open sepulcher," etc.[3]

It is also thus that with the epistle to the Corinthians (1 Cor. v. 7), he says, "that Christ, our passover, has been slain for us;[4] and thus he complains of some who say that there is no resurrection of the dead." It is thus that with the second epistle to the Thessalonians (ii. 3), he speaks of Christ, "who shall descend from heaven in glory when the man of sin (ὁ τῆς ἀποστασίας ἄνθρωπος), who speaketh strange and blasphemous things against the Most High shall manifest his audacious iniquity against us Christians."[5]

It is thus that with the epistle to the Hebrews, in his

[1] Apol. i. 46; ii. 6. Dial, pp. 310, 311, 326. Paris, 1636.
[2] Dial, chap. 23. [3] Rom. iii. 11, 12. [4] Dial, p. 338. [5] Ibid.

first apology, he says of Christ that he is "the Son and the apostle of God" (Ἄγγελος καὶ ἀπόστολος. This name is given to him only in Heb. iii. 1); and in his Dialogue [1] that he is "after the order of Melchizedek, king of Salem, and perpetual high priest of God." It is thus that with the Epistle to Titus (iii. 4,) and the epistle to the Romans (ii. 4), in employing the remarkable expressions of the apostle, he speaks of "the goodness and loving-kindness of God, and of the depth of its riches (ἡ γὰρ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία τοῦ Θεοῦ.) [2] It is thus that in his Address and Exhortation to the Gentiles, we find reminiscences of the Acts, and the epistle to the Corinthians, and to the Colossians. It is thus, in a word, that we may discover many remarkable coincidences between Justin and Paul, on the epistles to the Philippians and Timothy, as also to the Galatians and Ephesians, in their mutual quotations from the Septuagint. In a word, we may say, that with the exception of the catholic epistles and that to Philemon, there is not a book of the first canon, of which the trace can not be found in this ancient Father.

At the same time, fully to appreciate the entire value of his testimony, we must bear in mind that of all his works there remain to us complete and authentic only his two Apologies and his Dialogue, all three addressed, not to Christians, but to unbelievers. His other numerous writings composed for members of the church are almost entirely lost. These, undoubtedly, would have given us a much more abundant and definite testimony; for he lived many years in the same city with the three great leaders of the cotemporary heresies,[3] and combated them.

If then we were in possession of his "Treatise against Marcion," referred to by Eusebius,[4] or even the lost portion of his book "Of the Monarchy of God," we should certainly have in them much more numerous quotations from

[1] Dial. Paris, 1636, p. 341. [2] Ibid. p. 266.
[3] Cerdo, Marcion, and Valentinus.
[4] Hist. Ecc. chap. 37, (p. 140, Edit. of Valois, 1672.)

the New Testament. Eusebius informs us that the author in the latter of these works proved his thesis "by passages taken from the Scriptures;" but this portion is lost.

Two features universally distinguish his three apologetic treatises from his works now lost.

They are, first, that these three works, and particularly the Dialogue, would naturally make many more extracts from the Old Testament than from the New. So that we have 314 quotations of the one to 120 of the other. That was the rule, for, in analogous circumstances, we all would have done the same thing. If you were speaking to Jews, the Old Testament would be your only authority; and you would not cite the New Testament except to show them that it fulfilled Moses and the Prophets. If you were speaking to pagans, it is still the Old Testament which you would employ to show the high antiquity of the revelation and its divine superiority to all the instructions of their sages concerning the origin, duties, and destinies of our humanity. That was the method, as early as a century before Justin; the method of Philo and the Jewish Alexandrian school, in their controversies with the pagan world; as afterwards, that of Theophilus of Antioch, of Tatian, of Tertullian, and of Clement of Alexandria.

A second feature which should characterize the quotations of Justin in his apologetical writings, is that they should be made under less precise designations than we employ in quoting to those who are familiar with the Scriptures. He would seldom name the books by their titles known to us. He would call the gospels *Memoirs of the Apostles;* he would quote them from memory; giving the sense faithfully, without confining himself to their language; he would condense, combine, transpose certain sentences; associate two passages sometimes as one; and would not always quote the same passage in the same terms twice. But after all these liberties, he would preserve the characteristics and the phraseology of the New Testament, without any admixture of foreign ele-

ments, any apocryphal quotation, or any trace of cotemporary legends. This is precisely what Justin has done.

It is obvious why we have dwelt so long on the writings of this Father. His testimony is of so great importance from its antiquity, the extent and abundance of its quotations from the gospels, and from the perfect authenticity of the books which transmit it to us, that we must expect the modern opponents of our canonical Scriptures to obscure it in every possible way. This they have done, especially in Germany. Until a recent period no one had called in question the clear and numerous testimonies which Justin renders to our synoptical gospels; but the negative criticism of modern Neology after studying with great care the one hundred and twenty clear and detailed quotations from them by this Father, after gathering all the expressions which differ in the least from the scriptural text, and after seizing all the liberties of quotation found in Justin, and exaggerating their difficulties, has gone so far as to affirm that what he had before him was not our four gospels, but something else; according to some, a certain primitive gospel from which our four borrowed their quadruple narrative, according to others, the apocryphal gospel entitled, "Of the Hebrews;" after others again, a Harmony or combined Narrative of our Canonical Gospels; and finally, according to Mr. Credner a gospel "according to Peter" which, under divers forms had been current among the Jewish Christians. Protracted labors have been undergone by the learned Germans to sustain and to confute these strange hypotheses,[1] and the study of Justin has thus been very thorough. We shall go no farther in this controversy.[2] The defenders of the Holy Word will always

[1] See and compare Semisch, *Denkwürdigkeiten Justins* (Hamburg, 1848); Credner *Beiträge*, i. 92–267 (Halle. 1832): Schwegler *Nachapostolische Zeitalter*, i. 217–231. — "Wie er gar nicht die Zeit kann gekannt haben, wo man dieselbe (die Evangeliensammlung) nicht hatte."

[2] Semisch has treated it skillfully, p. 16 to 33. — It may be found exposed and demolished in Mr. Westcott's learned work, "A General Survey of the Canon of the N. T." Cambridge, 1855.

encounter serious objections, which, in every age, will call for replies; there are others entirely temporary and local in their character, requiring only a temporary and local refutation. These we regard as of this number. They have made a noise, but have also done too much violence to the facts of history to be able to stand. How can it be maintained that Justin employed apocryphal gospels at the very time when by his side, in the same city of Rome, Valentinus the heretic used only our four canonical gospels, and a complete canon (integro instrumento), as Tertullian informs us?[1] How, at the time when he himself declared to the emperor that the Gospels or "Memoirs of the Apostles," memoirs undoubtedly then definitely recognized, were read every Sunday in all the churches of the empire? How, when they were everywhere so known that Trypho the Jew, as soon as Justin named them to him, recognized them and said he had read them? How, in the time while Irenæus, then in Lyons in the prime of life, was constantly speaking of "the quadriform Gospel" (*τετράμορφον εὐαγγέλιον*) as of a complete whole in its kind and everywhere acknowledged with an incomparable firmness?[2] How, when we remember that Irenæus going to Lyons had been at Rome during Justin's long residence there, returning there about the year 77, only ten years after the martyrdom of this Father, to visit bishop Eleutherus? How can we suppose too that Justin should in his two apologies have made use of the gospels which were not yet in existence? How suppose that he and Irenæus used different gospels? How imagine that Justin himself and his immediate disciples with all the churches should mean different books, in using the same titles? How pretend that in so short a time an immense revolution had taken place in the Christian world without being perceived; had taken place everywhere, and yet left

[1] De Præscript. Hæreticor. cap. 38.

[2] Contr. Hæres. Lib. 3, cap. ii. Olshausen says, (Aechtheit d. 4, can. Evang. p. 272), "We see in all this passage how Irenæus could never have known a time when he had not had the collection of the Gospels."

no trace of itself? How suppose that all the churches all over the world were silently brought to agree with one consent to change their Bible, so that those sacred books which were publicly read every Sunday in the year 140 were superseded by others in 167, at the death of Justin, though still called by the same names? Surely, nothing more pitifully betrays the distress of a system than such impossibilities imagined to prop it up a little while.

Objections to his Testimony.

We will then briefly notice the three principal objections alleged by the adversaries when they pretend that Justin, in his one hundred and twenty citations, had before him other gospels than ours.[1] First, they say, Justin although he once mentions the apostle John,[2] as the author of the Apocalypse, never names Matthew, Mark, or Luke even while quoting their respective gospels at length. But we reply that such a mentioning would have been out of place in such a book; that none of the apologists who followed him did it; neither Tatian, disciple of Justin, nor Athenagoras; nor even Tertullian in his "Liber Apologeticus," who names them so frequently in his other writings; nor Theophilus of Antioch, in his books to Autolycus; nor Clement of Alexandria, in his "Exhortation to the Gentiles;" nor Cyprian, in his writing to Demetrian; nor Origen, in his books against Celsus; nor Lactantius; nor Arnobius; nor even Eusebius, in his "Evangelical Preparation." Theophilus and Clement, with Justin, have named only John; and that only once. Lactantius[3] even blames Cyprian for having quoted the Scriptures in a controversy with a pagan.

[1] Semisch has skillfully examined these strange theories, *Denkwürdigkeiten Justins* (Hamb. 1848, p. 16–28). — This whole controversy is carefully examined in Mr. Westcott's work on the canon (Cambridge, 1855). He has very judiciously availed himself of the German labors, (pp. 112-216.)

[2] In his dialogue with Trypho, p. 308. — Paris, folio, 1636.

[3] Instit. v. 4.

In the second place, they say again, "See the extreme freedom with which Justin quotes the gospels; he refers to them from memory; often, if he gives the sense it is by different words, abridging or combining." But the answer is as simple as decisive, and to give it only requires a closer study of this author. This has been done by Semisch and Credner, comparing his quotations of the New Testament with his quotations of Moses and the prophets. Now it is precisely the same freedom, both in his Apology, and in his Dialogue with Trypho. — You may read more than sixty pages in these works, in which you shall see Justin taking the same liberty with the Old Testament as with the New, giving passages from memory, paraphrasing them to render them more clear, transposing them, combining them, and adhering more to the sense than the words. And also, when he quotes them a second time it is with notable changes in the words, to apply them more pointedly to his subject. If then he could so quote the Old Testament so well known to the Jewish people, why should he quote the Apostles and Evangelists differently?

A third objection, is that Justin quotes words of Jesus Christ not found in our Gospels. "Our Lord," he writes in his dialogue with Trypho,[1] "has said, 'On these words which surprise you, I will judge you.'"[2] And on p. 253, Christ says, "There shall be schisms and heresies." We reply 1st, that neither of these sentences is found in the apocryphal gospels; 2d, that Justin nowhere says he had read these in the "Memoirs of the Apostles;" 3d, that we must not be surprised if this Father, writing a very few years after the death of John and the unpublished recollections of the words of Christ, could traditionally repeat that sentence of the Lord, as Paul had himself repeated that which we find in the twentieth chapter

[1] Paris Ed. 1686, p. 267. English edition, chaps. 47, and 33.

[2] Some read here a paraphrase of this sentence: "Where the carcass is there the eagles will be gathered together." Others are alleged, they are doubtful. See Kirchhofer, 1842, (p. 104) *Quellensammlung*, etc.

of Acts, and yet nowhere in the gospels "The Lord Jesus said, It is more blessed to give than to receive."

In a word, it is beyond doubt, that from the year 140 of the Christian era, Justin, in his Apology, and shortly afterwards, in his Dialogue, cites very abundantly our synoptical gospels, declaring that they were written by apostles of Christ, and their companions, and stating to the Roman emperor that on every Sunday all the Christians in the world read them publicly with the writings of the Old Testament in their sacred assemblies, before presenting their prayers to God, or celebrating the supper and collecting the alms from the faithful.

Other Historical Monuments of the Canon in this first half of the Second Century.

Justin, moreover, is not the only witness of this epoch. Although he is the only one of all the Fathers whose entire and authentic writings have come down to us, still we find in Eusebius many extracts from other writers of the same period, who render incidental testimony to the canon, and who, leading us for a moment to the banks of that stream whose source we are seeking, permit us again to see its majestic flow, and thus to appreciate at a glance the high place which the collection of the sacred Scriptures then already held in the estimate and habits of the people of God.

Thus, for example, in his third book, chapter 37, Eusebius relates that, under the reign of Trajan, at the beginning of the second century, in the remote days of the ministry and martyrdom of Ignatius, and while that Quadratus who "had received miraculous gifts with the daughters of Philip," was flourishing, "a large number of disciples became famous among the first successors of the apostles by going forth to spread throughout the earth the salutary seeds of the kingdom of heaven." "The greater part of them," he adds, "having, through the divine Word, their souls penetrated with

a vehement love of the (true) philosophy, obeyed the injunction of the Saviour, by distributing their goods to the poor; then, abandoning their country and going on long journeys, they accomplished the work of evangelists among those who had never heard the word of faith; ambitious as they were of announcing Christ and of transmitting the Scriptures of the divine Evangelists."

You see then, these holy men of God, at the beginning of the second century, successors and imitators of the apostles, at the time when the apostle John himself was giving his testimony for Jesus Christ at Ephesus, in the province of Asia, and when the charisms of the Spirit yet accompanied the preaching of the gospel; you see them traveling with the "Scriptures of the divine Evangelists" in their hands, carrying them even into barbarous countries. You see them there not only profoundly penetrated themselves with "the divine word." as Eusebius says, but leaving it after them in written documents and "transmitting it to these distant peoples." We also learn again by Eusebius (II. E. v. 10), that Pantænus, when he had penetrated India towards the close of the second century, found that the Gospel of Matthew had preceded his arrival there nearly a century, "having been left there, written in Hebrew letters by Bartholomew, one of the twelve apostles, and having brought several persons to a knowledge of Jesus Christ."

By this account of Eusebius we are then once more brought to the very banks of the Scriptures, and can trace this pure and beneficent stream up to the apostolical fountain out of which it springs, to receive some additional tributaries, to move on complete, in its majestic course, bearing the living waters to all the people of the world.

It is sufficiently evident that Eusebius is here speaking of definite and recognized gospels which have not been altered in their course from the beginning; in a word, the gospels which in his day were revered by the whole of Christendom.

But if, in consequence of various accidents, there remain to us so few monuments of the Fathers of the second century the providence of God has preserved to us others still more important and more indisputable. These are left to us by the most violent enemies of these very Fathers. Their testimony shall then speak to us with so much the more authority, as it was involuntary and as it in our day serves the gospel despite of all the hatred which these men bore toward it. They little thought, — those infidels of the first two centuries — that their very attacks would avail even in the remotest ages of the future to confound their imitators. They were, in almost every feature, counterparts of the men of this nineteenth century whose systems they now overthrow; and it is by them that the holy convictions of the primitive church in regard to the canon are most powerfully attested to us against all the negations of the modern infidelity.

These adversaries, in the age of Trajan, of Adrian, and of Antoninus Pius, were of two kinds: the one, infidels, among the Jews and pagans, calumniated the church from without; the others, heretics among the Ebionites and the Gnostics, tormented it from within, by their erroneous doctrines, on account of which they called themselves "Gnostics," or men of science; — "science falsely so called," as Paul terms it (1 Tim. vi. 20.) Now it must be observed that it was, as ordinarily happens, in times when the gospel was making the greatest progress, that the enemy excited this twofold war of infidelity and heresy. But it was also in these very attacks so audacious and so rude that these men left after them in the literature of their age such precious monuments of the canon. Their remote attempts shall then lead us again to the banks of the river, even while themselves endeavoring only to trouble the waters with their feet, and to throw into them their filth; and these very attempts shall turn, contrary to their expectation, to the honor of the Scriptures. Not only shall they serve to point out to us their course of this river during the whole second century, but they shall show us all

the cotemporary churches standing respectfully on its banks defending its stream, and drinking there with delight the sparkling waters of eternal life.

SECTION VIII.

TESTIMONY OF THE INFIDEL PAGANS IN THE SECOND CENTURY.

Their Writings.

THE first enemies of Christianity, in order to find objections, entered upon the study of the Scriptures, boasting of "thus destroying them with their own weapons;" and it is by this very labor that they have furnished us, even in their most violent writings, a brilliant acknowledgment both of our collection of sacred books, and of the authority, already everywhere established, which it then possessed in all the churches. "All these things which we object to your system," said "The Jew" of Celsus (the opponent whom Celsus made to speak in his famous book against Christianity,) [1] "all these things we draw from your own Scriptures; and fortified with these quotations, we have need of no other witness against you than yourselves; for you thus perish by your own hands."

The writings of these ancient enemies exist no longer; but many of the books composed at that time to refute them having come down to us, furnish us an indisputable testimony; and under this form it may be said that the ancient defenders have served the modern cause of the Gospel more effectually by their quotations than by their arguments. It is thus that almost all the objections of Celsus are reproduced to us by Origen; many of those of Amelius, by Eusebius; and of those of Porphyry, by Jerome and Chrysostom.

[1] His Λόγος ἀληθής. This book has perished; but abundant quotations from it are found in the "Refutation of Celsus" by Origen.

But as Amelius and Porphyry belong rather to the third century, we shall speak here only of Celsus who flourished in the first half of the second century, under the reign of Adrian, that is from A. D. 117 to A. D. 138.

Testimony of Celsus.

Celsus (or rather *Kelsos*) was an epicurean philosopher filled with fervent hatred of Christians. He knew how to employ with much wit and skill all the arms of logic and ridicule to decry their Lord, their doctrines, and their Scriptures. Origen, in his eight books "Against Celsus," [1] speaks of his writings, without informing us of his exact age, or place of residence. We know only, that he was older than the famous infidel Lucian of Samosata, who lived under the Antonines, and who dedicated to him one of his "Dialogues." Mr. Kirchhofer, (Quellensammlung, etc., p. 331 : Zurich, 1842), on the authority of a passage of Celsus speaking of Marcion apparently, would place him later than we should in the second century; but it is merely conjecture on his part; the passage does not name Marcion. (Origen against Celsus, Lib. ii. chap. 27, vol. i. opp.)

The testimony which Celsus renders to the canon of the gospels is of great weight from its remote age. Chrysostom, too, fifteen hundred years ago, already indicated to the men of his time this homage of an infidel to our sacred books. In his sixth Homily on the first epistle to the Corinthians, he says, "Admire how the gospel was early spread into all parts of the habitable world; for Celsus, and after him Porphyry, who have said so much against us, are sufficient witnesses of the antiquity of our holy Books."

It is thus then that this adversary, in the beginning of the second century, like Voltaire and the English Deists in the

[1] The best edition is that of Spencer (Cambridge, 1658, 4to.) We ordinarily quote from the complete edition of the Benedictines, four vols. folio, 1733–1759.

eighteenth, gave himself to a certain study of the character and contents of the Scriptures, from sheer hatred to them. Now the way in which he speaks of our four gospels and the fact that he quotes no other, show with evidence, says Kirchhofer, that he not only knew them by this name, but that he attributed them to the disciples of Jesus, and that in his day they were universally used in the churches. He never makes an objection to their authenticity; and it is not to be questioned that if there had been any reason to doubt it, however feeble, such a man would have seized such a weapon with both hands. But he does not even think of such a thing; on the contrary, as we have said, he boasts in quoting them of "fighting Christians with their own weapons." In a word, all the fragments preserved by Origen render it in the highest degree probable that Celsus had read the collection of our four gospels, and that he had read no other. It is then not Christians only, but even pagans likewise, who attest to us the universal dissemination of the sacred collection of the gospels in the second century.

Celsus, in order to decry the character of Jesus, produces with great fullness nearly all the features of his life and the larger portion of his words. The only collection of these passages in the book of Kirchhofer embraces twenty-three pages, and you may there discover alternatively and exclusively each one of our four gospels as well as many passages of Paul's epistles. And when he has quoted all the features of the birth, life, miracles, sermons, sufferings, death, and resurrection of our Lord, he declares that he had taken them "from the very writings of Jesus' disciples; from your own Scriptures; (*τοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν μαθητῶν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ γραφεῖσιν — ἐκ τῶν ὑμετέρων συγγραμμάτων καὶ' ἃ καὶ ὑμεῖς συγγεγράφατε.*)"[1]

For example, he represents Jesus as being, according to our Scriptures, the pretended son of a virgin, announced by angels, adored by Magi, fleeing into Egypt, baptized by John, having seen a dove descend at his baptism, etc. He re-

[1] Orig. against Celsus, ii. 74–49.

proaches him with having said the following things: "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven. Behold the lilies of the field, the birds of the air, they sow not, neither do they reap. If any one shall say to you, Christ is here, or Christ is there, believe him not. Many shall say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not driven out devils in thy name, and in thy name done wonderful works, etc. But I will say to them, 'Depart from me, ye workers of iniquity.'" "O Light," he exclaims, "O Truth! Behold him then himself, your own Scriptures attest it, behold him warning us with his own voice that others, even though they are bad men, shall perform the same miracles!"

But moreover, Celsus, in order to decry our different gospels and set them against each other, manifestly represents Matthew and Luke as opposed to each other in their genealogies; and he elsewhere refers evidently to the gospel of John when relating how Jesus showed his disciples the wounds of his hands and feet (Orig. against Celsus, ii. 55), when speaking of the blood flowing from his side (ii. 36–59), of the earthquake and darkness; when reproaching Christians for calling Jesus *Son, and Word of God*, and Christ for saying to his disciples, "With desire have I desired to eat this passover with you;" (i. 70,) and again, "If they persecute you in one city, flee into another." "Why then," exclaims the Jew of Celsus to Jesus, "Why then flee hither and thither with thy disciples? Why, if a good general is never betrayed by his soldiers, nor even a brigand by his miserable followers, why could not Jesus secure the same attachment on the part of his disciples?" (ii. 12.) "Why again does Jesus complain in these words, 'My Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me.'?" (ii. 24.) "Why does he complain so much of the thirst which the feeblest men have often borne? Why, when they give him gall and vinegar, does he swallow them with avidity? Why is he ready with his threats, exclaiming, 'Woe to you, I say!'? Why then, O

Jesus, why didst thou need in thine infancy to be warned by an angel, and carried into Egypt to escape death?" etc.

In fine, Celsus designates equally all the four gospels, when he opposes those which (as Mark and Matthew) mention but one angel at the tomb, to those (as Luke and John) who mention two. He reproaches them even with having employed four, "for some of you Christians, like drunken men who strike themselves with their own hands, have, from one primitive Scripture, three times, four times, many times rewritten and reconstructed the gospel, in order to be able to reply to arguments by negations. (Lib. ii. 27.)

But again Celsus has not confined his accusations to our four gospels; he has gone even to Paul's epistles to find them. He speaks, for instance, of the prophecies which, in the second Thessalonians and the first Timothy, relate to the great apostasy of modern times. Origen says, "I think that in these passages he has poorly comprehended the apostolical word." (1 Tim. iv. 2.)

Again, he reproaches Christians with injuring one another, whilst they are heard to say, "The world is crucified to me, and I to the world." (Gal. vi. 14.) Origen says, (v. 64,) "Celsus here has been able to produce these words only as a recollection of the epistles of Paul." Elsewhere (vi. 12,) Origen says, "But I pass again to another accusation of Celsus where, badly understanding our Scriptures, he reproaches us with saying that what is wisdom among men is folly with God, whereas Paul simply said (1 Cor. iii. 19), "The wisdom of this world is foolishness with God." And again, alluding to 1 Cor. viii. 11, he reproaches Christians with their conduct in regard to meats sacrificed to idols. Origen says, (viii. 24,) "Let us hear these words of Celsus. See his dilemma, 'If these idols are nothing, what is there so terrible in taking part in our festivals? And if there really are certain demons, then they are evidently demons of God, to which you must render faith and homage according to the laws, and which you should invoke in order to make them propitious.'"

Origen adds, "It would be useful then to explain here the entire passage of Paul in his first letter to the Corinthians on things sacrificed to idols."

Force of this Testimony.

Let us here pause thoroughly to consider all the force of this testimony rendered to the Canon of the Sacred Scriptures so near the death of the Apostle John. See then how this Voltaire of the second century crushes, without intending it, the men of the nineteenth century who pretend to raise their doubts against the existence of a canon in the second. See him who declares their doubts absurd since he himself employed against the Christians *their own weapons*, their "Scriptures," "the Scriptures composed," he says, "by the very disciples of Jesus," those which everybody then received as such and on which was erected the entire edifice of their faith; those the authenticity of which was called in question by no one among friends or foes at that time; those which they read "every Sunday" in all the churches in the world! Let any one read merely the scriptural quotations of Celsus, entirely borrowed from the "Refutation" which Origen made. He will be struck with the irresistible force of this involuntary testimony, and be tempted to say in his turn to the enemies of Christianity, *οὐδενὸς ἄλλου μάρτυρος χρήζομεν*. "We have, O Celsus, need of no other witness against you than yourself." And we have need of no other witnesses against your imitators of the nineteenth century than you yourself at the beginning of the second!

These quotations from Celsus, which might be so easily multiplied,[1] will alone suffice to prove abundantly the universal reign of our Sacred Books in the first years of the second century, and thus, their promulgation much earlier; for Celsus everywhere takes for granted that priority; our Sacred Books are there considered to be as old as the Christian

[1] See Celsus himself, in the Bened. Collection, p. 71, note 1.

Church. Celsus has not the slightest suspicion that it can be otherwise; the idea of putting in question their authority in the church and their universally recognized authenticity, does not even enter his mind; for it could not then enter any mind, and therefore his hatred must have recourse to altogether different accusations. "Behold your Scriptures," he on the contrary says to them in other terms, "you can not deny them, they are the very disciples of your Master who wrote them; but if I admit with you their apostolical authority, I am going to show you their errors, contradictions, immoralities, plagiarisms from Plato, and impossibilities." We see then, Celsus utterly discards the whole system of attack by the modern infidels, against our canon; he declares to them that it is destitute of all historical value, and that they must abandon it. And at the same time, observe closely, it would have been for Celsus a more murderous weapon than any other against the then rising and the future Christian system if he could have thrown the slightest doubt on the question of the authenticity of their books; for he could thus have torn up its very foundation. But this weapon could not then have been employed, nor did the idea of employing it ever occur to Porphyry, never to Amelius, never to Julian. And yet, this thought of bringing in question the authenticity of our sacred books and the agreement of all the churches of the world in receiving them, might have presented itself to the hatred of Celsus, because although the twenty-two homologomens were uncontested everywhere and from the beginning, yet this was not the case with the five later epistles; for the question of these books was not then entirely decided, and the Christian teachers were still studying it in a spirit of mutual respect, of patience, and of peace. But you will find no trace of doubt as to the origin of the first canon, its authenticity, the universal confidence which it obtained, the continual employment of it in the worship of every Christian assembly. Surely then, we must say, although we had only the True Discourse (Λόγος ἀληθής) of Celsus, or rather the

fragments preserved by Origen, still we should be obliged to conclude that at the opening of the second century Christians had possessed for a long time a sacred volume, attributed to the apostles by their enemies themselves, and which the whole church adopted as the rule of faith and practice.

But we pass on to the heretics. Their testimony will be still more explicit, and so full that it will appear to surpass even that of the Fathers and of the enemies of the church, which we have just considered, for we shall there hear witnesses more ancient than Justin Martyr or Celsus.

SECTION IX.

TESTIMONY OF THE HERETICS IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE SECOND CENTURY.

The Character of this Testimony.

THE heretics whose unanimous voice testifies at this epoch, are not few in number as are the cotemporary Fathers whose works remain to us. They are an army, a cloud of witnesses. The ancient authors have counted in this remote period as many as thirty-two heretical sects very diverse in their dogmas, but very unanimous, as we shall see in attesting to us the existence of the canon and its authority in all the churches. And such is the weight of this proof that we have seen in our times many German defenders of the canon concentrate the whole force of their argument on this point.[1] This testimony is involuntary, since we must trace it, as in the case of Celsus, to the most pernicious enemies of primitive Christianity. We must here again admire the manner in which Providence has employed such men, after seventeen hundred years, to reduce to powder the negations of modern criticism. Behold these ancient enemies, the cause of so much grief to

[1] See their "Introductions" to the study of the New Testament, beginning with that of Hug, (Einleitung, Thesis i. p. 88.)

the early churches, now uniting their voices with those of the Fathers of the second century to confirm against the rationalists of the nineteenth, the authenticity of our Sacred Books and the divine authority then attributed to them in all the Christian churches of the earth! Hug remarks,[1] "It is a thing well worthy of our serious attention, that the depositions of the heretics, so fortuitously preserved, attest not only the existence of the New Testament in the second century, but also its anterior origin; for these depositions relate not only to their times; they go very much farther back, and attest that the authors of our Holy Scriptures were the apostles Peter, John, and Paul." To exhibit the full force of this proof we should give it in a much larger number of quotations than we can introduce here. The numerous writings of all these heretics have perished, with those of the pagans cotemporary with them; but we find the most abundant citations of them in the refutations of them by Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Hippolytus, and several others.

Our faith must not be shocked at witnessing so many heresies springing up so near the times of the apostles. Heresies spring and flourish only in times of revival and life; the entire history of the people of God shows us that these revolts were the more frequent the more pure and living the churches became. Paul also goes so far as to intimate that they serve their purpose in God's kingdom. He tells us in 1 Cor. xi. 19, "There must be heresies;" and he takes care to warn the Corinthian church that God knows too how to make use of that which is evil for the good of his people, because the very heresies which torment them purify them. He says, "Their word will eat as doth a canker;" (2 Tim. ii. 17, 18,) but they accomplish frequently also in a flock the work of the leech on a sick body; they cast out some who ought not to be in it; they result, he says, in manifesting those who are worthy of commendation, and exercise beneficially the

[1] Einleitung, Thesis i. p. 88.

elect. Let us not then be astonished at the great number of heretics in the second century, or even in the first. Never did the gospel extend itself so rapidly over the earth as in the days of Trajan and Adrian (from A. D. 98 to A. D. 138); but never likewise did such a multitude of monstrous sects spring up in the church of God.

Irenæus, in his great work, has described at length all those of his time; and the celebrated Hippolytus, thirty years after him, has reviewed them in his "Refutation." He enumerates thirty-two; four belonging to the Ophites, who, already in John's day, mixed their own prophecies with Revelation; eleven, to the different sects of gnostics abandoned in various ways to the vain deceptions of a philosophy which they complacently styled the *gnosis* or the *science* (1 Tim. vi. 20); twelve others, to the Ebionites, Jewish sects which repelled the doctrines of grace and of the divinity of Jesus Christ; others, mixed with ebionism and gnosticisms, and finally five others, who scarcely erred except on questions of discipline, and who were orthodox at least on the doctrine of God and his Christ.

Now all these sects have in the following ways, rendered striking testimony to the canon of the Scriptures: 1. The most of them, notwithstanding their wanderings, and the rashness of their exegesis, recognize the authority of our Sacred Books. This, for example, was the case of the powerful sect of the Valentinians, who alone constituted six sects of gnostics; it was the case also of the disciples of Carpocrates, and of those of Theodotus, who belonged rather to the ebionitish sects. Tertullian [1] says, "Valentinus appears to have used a complete canon (integro instrumento);" and Irenæus contents himself with saying of this sect, that it had "a preference for the writings of John." He adds, "They seek to sustain their errors by apostolical and evangelical quotations, although they pervert them by a false interpretation and exercise bad faith in their exegesis."

[1] De Præscript. Hæreticor. cap. 3; Lib. i. cap. 336.

2. Even those very heretics who repudiate a part of the canon at the same time attest it in a remarkable manner by the fact, that their respective sects, drawn into two opposite currents, mutually contradict each other. The Sacred Books which one rejected were preferred by the other; the ebionites, considering Paul as a renegade from Judaism, condemned his writings and those of Luke his companion in labor, whilst, on the contrary, many of the anti-judaizing gnostics, Marcion especially, and all his followers, condemned Matthew, Mark, Peter, and John, regarding them as apostles of the circumcision. It is thus, that, far from being shaken in our confidence in the canon, these contradictory testimonies, taken together, are equivalent to depositions confirming it.

3. In fine, we must especially observe that of all the heretics of the second century, even among the worst, there is not one who denied the authenticity of the books of the canon, and of the very books which they would not accept. Never, between them and the church, did the controversy turn upon the apostolicity of the twenty-two homologomens, nor on the credit which they had down to that time obtained in the entire church. This question was not even stated by them. In rejecting some of them, they rejected only their doctrine; and you will never hear them insinuating that these Scriptures were not written by the apostles and their companions, whose names they bear. They were satisfied with maintaining that the instruction was not conformed to the intentions of Jesus Christ. If Marcion repudiated three of Paul's thirteen letters, it was, not because they were not Paul's, but, because Paul was imperfectly inspired when he wrote them; and if he rejected Matthew and Peter, it was not that they had not written the books bearing their names, but that in writing them they "Judaized," the one in his Epistle, and the other in his Gospel. But none of the Marcionites failed to recognize that in rejecting them he opposed the opinion of the church. Let this twofold avowal be well observed, and this double testimony to the historical authen-

ticity of our holy books. It is of great force, for with such hatred against the church, with such science and skill to combat her, these audacious men, if they could have discovered the smallest possibility of contesting these two facts, would certainly not have failed to employ so fatal an arm, by which, at one blow, if it had been truth, they could have demolished their adversaries, and have terminated the quarrel for ever.

To give the reader a better view of this proof, we shall pass rapidly in review the principal heresies of the epoch, beginning with Marcion, and ascending thence to other sects still nearer to the days of the apostles.[1]

Marcion.

The Marcionitic sects were certainly the most audacious in their efforts against the Scriptures; and yet we shall see how, even in their negations, they render a resistless testimony both to the anterior existence of the first canon, and to the universal authority it then had in the churches of God.

Marcion was born in the days of John toward the close of the first century at Sinope on the shores of the Euxine. His father, bishop of that city, having had the misfortune to discover a serious crime of his son, was obliged to expel him from the church, and firmly refused to restore him. Incapable of bearing this mortification, Marcion secretly left the city and went to Rome.[2] There, as he was a man of talent and energy, he soon exercised a great personal influence, and was accepted by the Roman clergy. He dared even aspire, says Epiphanius, to the first place (*προεδρία*), when he was rejected by the elders (*πρεσβυτέροις*) of the church, who had

[1] We shall not here speak of the Ophites or Cerinthians, nor of the other heretics of the first century who are less known to us, nor of the Arians and Manicheans who came afterward; nor even of Theodotus, the tanner of Byzantium who flourished in the latter half of the second century. We shall confine ourselves to the first half.

[2] Epiph. Hæres. xlii. 1. See also Cave, Dict. Eccl. Hist. Bingham Orig. Eccl. i. p. 266. Massuet, De Gnost. Reb. sec. 135.

learned the cause of his flight from Sinope. He then threw himself with desperation into the party of Cerdo. This was a dangerous Syrian heretic, already unhappily celebrated in Rome as head of a powerful anti-judaizing sect. Marcion gave himself entirely up to his gnostic suggestions, and before long passed beyond his master in the audacity of his doctrines, the great number of his followers and his attempts against the Scriptures. He expressed his negations with extreme precision, and knew how to impress his system with the strongly positive features of his own character. The attractiveness of his powerful person and the seductive audacity of his philosophy soon brought him a large number of disciples in Italy, Egypt, Syria, and Persia; and his sect became so powerful and so active that in the fourth century, if we may believe Epiphanius, it retained still some congregations and bishops. Also Irenæus tells us (Hæres. iii. 3) that this bold man pretended to demand a recognition from the bishops of the church, and that having met Polycarp in Rome, he dared to approach and say to him, "Recognize me, Polycarp!" "I recognize thee," replied the martyr, "as the first-born of Satan."

We can no more determine than Tertullian,[1] the time when Marcion went to fix his residence at Rome. "In what year," says this Father, "of the first Antonines the breath of the Dog-Star blew this poisonous exhalation from the Black Sea, I have taken no pains to inquire." But since Justin Martyr, in his first Apology, (chap. 26,) written in A. D. 139, speaks of Marcion as "still teaching;" and since his doctrine was then already widely spread, many years must have elapsed since he left the church. His first arrival in the Capital of the Empire must have long preceded the death of Adrian.

This remark is important; it brings us near the days of John. Another fact worthy of notice, was the simultaneous

[1] Adv. Marcion, i. 19. Quoto quidem anno Antonini Maj. de Ponte suo exhalaverit aura canicularis, non curavi investigare; de quo tamen constat, Antonianus est hæreticus, sub Pio impius.

presence in Rome of Cerdo, Marcion, Tatian, and Valentinus, with Justin Martyr. It seems to confirm the testimony which men so contrasted rendered at the same time and in the same city to the existence, the use, and the authority of the first canon in the cotemporary church.

Tertullian says,[1] "In separating the *Law* from the *Gospel*, Marcion pretended not to be an innovator, but merely 'to restore the apostolical rule falsified by its adversaries.'"

In general, the heretics of the second century, with many rationalists of the nineteenth, not discerning the harmony of the divine revelations and those intimate relations which in the order of grace bind together the respective doctrines of the Law and the Gospel, could see between these revelations only a desperate antagonism. Thus persuaded of their irreconcilableness they accepted certain Scriptures and rejected others; and permitting themselves thus to go to contrary extremes, they declared they could neither reconcile Peter or James with Paul, nor Matthew or John with Luke. Thus, some, particularly the ebionites, as Irenæus says, "Holding Paul to be an Apostate from the Law," rejected him spitefully; whilst Marcion and many others, pushing the doctrines of Paul to the other extreme, on the contrary, held him alone to be a true apostle, and admitted to their canon only his epistles reduced to the number of ten, and the Gospel of Luke. In their aversion to everything Jewish, they even maintained that the God of the Jews (the *Demiurge* or Creator of the visible world), was very different from the God preached by Jesus Christ. Marcion too, like our rationalists, pretended to establish, not only what he called the *antitheses* (or contradictions) of the two Testaments, but also the *antitheses* of Peter and Paul, and those of Luke and Mark, or Luke and John. His canon was divided into two parts which, Epiphanius says, he called "the Evangelicon" and "the Apostolicon." As to his Apostolicon, he made it up of ten only of Paul's epistles. He excluded of the thirteen let-

[1] Adv. Marcion, i. 20.

ters which bear Paul's name only three of the pastoral epistles and that to the Hebrews, for he had retained Philemon. Tertullian,[1] too, informs us that his arrangement of the epistles, no one can see why, was not that which the church was accustomed to use. He boasted also that he had reëstablished the true title of the Epistle to the Ephesians, calling it, "*Epistle to the Laodiceans.*" (Col. iv. 16.) And the same Father assures us again that he had made alterations in these letters, especially in that to the Romans, "*to bring away whatever he chose from the integrity of our instrument.*"[2] At the same time Epiphanius,[3] who brings the same reproach against him, and who specifies seven of these alterations, shows us that they were not important and were not retrenchments. There are indeed only three that have any authority for them.

As to his Evangelicon, he allowed himself, as we have said, serious liberties. He received only one gospel, which he called "the Gospel of Christ," and which the church called "the Gospel of Marcion," or "the Gospel of the Black Sea" (Ponticum.) He had himself arranged and modified it, and it was simply (according to the unanimous testimony of Irenæus, Tertullian, and Epiphanius), "a mutilated Luke."[4] The text of this Evangelist was its thread; but there were constant alterations and retrenchments, among them those of the prodigal son, nativity of the Saviour, and the events of his death on the cross.[5] "These heretics, giving themselves out as truer and wiser than the apostles," says Irenæus,[6] "and pretending that the apostles had issued only a gospel imbued

[1] Adv. Marcion, v. 20. See too, Epiphan. Hæres., xlii. This places in Marcion Philemon ninth, and Philippians tenth.

[2] Adv. Marcion, v. 13.

[3] Hæres. xlii. Yet it would seem from the commentary of Origen on Rom. xvi. 25, that he had omitted the last two chapters.

[4] A reconstruction of Marcion's gospel may be found in Halm's "Das Evang. Marcions in seiner ursprünglichen Gestalt. (Königsberg, 1823.)

[5] Epiph. Hæres. xlii. See Kirchhofer, Quellensammlung, p. 336.

[6] Hæres. Lib. iii., chap. xii., sec. 12.

with Judaism, came to cut the Scriptures in two, rejecting this and retrenching that, as if nothing was genuine which they had not subjected to their retrenchment."

And it is well to remark again that Marcion avowed publicly that he "had removed certain passages from the original Scriptures of Christ." Tertullian [1] says, "Thou hast thyself avowed it in a certain letter, but by what authority? Who art thou? A prophet? Then prophesy. An apostle? Then preach publicly. An apostolical man? Then think like the apostles. A simple Christian? Then believe what is given us. But if thou art none of these, I tell thee by good right, die!"

All these reproaches of the Fathers show us with what jealousy the text of our holy Books was then guarded.

In the mean time, we may say in passing, it must not be imagined that this mutilating of which Marcion and the Marcionites were guilty, was an attempt often repeated. It was, on the contrary, a very rare scandal, so much horror did it excite; and Marcion has remained so famous in history from this excess of audacity, that Origen, a century after him, reviewing [2] the history of the church, could say, "I know none who have cut and mutilated (μεταχαράξαντας) the Gospel, except the followers of Marcion and Valentinus; perhaps too, those of Lucian." And again, even as to Valentinus, have we not heard Tertullian assure us that that heretic employed "a complete Instrument"? So that it was only by gross perversions, and not by material alterations that he did violence to the Scriptures.

Let us now pause to examine more closely the evidence of the testimony which, from this first quarter of the second century, Marcion renders to the canon. And, to that end, transporting ourselves to Rome in A. D. 128, only twenty-five years after the death of John, let us seat ourselves on the threshold of that fatal school of philosophy where the young

[1] De Carne Christi, cap. 2.
[2] In his treatise against Celsus, cap. ii. 27.

professor of Sinope was announcing his gnosis. Or rather, let us go then eleven years later, when, in the same city, the martyr Justin, daring to address his first Apology to the Emperor, the Senate and the people of Rome (*καὶ δήμῳ παντὶ Ῥωμαίων*), said to them, "How many impious persons are there whom none of you thinks of persecuting, and especially that Marcion of the Euxine Sea,[1] who is even now engaged in teaching his followers to pronounce blasphemies against God the Creator, and even to deny him, pretending that there is another, superior to Him?" Let us go, we say, to the door of this school where the persecutors of the Christians abstain from interfering with him, and we shall then obtain all the proofs necessary as to the existence of the canon. "Had the Christian church," we have been asked, "already in these first years of the second century her collection of the holy Scriptures?" Who can make this inquiry after having visited Marcion and his school? Who will suppose that the church had not her collection when this man, violently separated from her, had his? He who showed himself in so many ways outrageous toward the Scriptures, who maintained such revolting doctrines concerning the God Creator, the Old Testament, the incarnation of Jesus Christ, while calling himself a Christian philosopher, he, Marcion, could have had his canon well defined, composed of one gospel and ten epistles, whilst the Christian church who reproached him so severely for not accepting the other books, had not her canon! And we shall hear modern doctors telling us in their "Introductions," that "the canon published by Marcion is the first of which ecclesiastical literature has left us any monument!" As if the complaints of the Fathers who were indignant at his mutilations were not monuments of the complete canon of the cotemporary church, as much as of the mutilated canon of this heretic!

[1] Ap. i. 26. *Μακρίωνα δέ τινα Ποντικὸν, ὃς* KAI NYN ETI *ἐστὶ διδάσκων τοὺς πειθομένους.*

The better to appreciate this testimony, we must carefully observe the following considerations: —

1. It can be proved by numerous quotations from Tertullian and Irenæus that Marcion was well acquainted with both the collection of the four gospels and the three Pauline epistles excluded from his canon. Kirchhofer has done this in his "Collection of Sources."

2. Marcion never disputed the authenticity of the nine books excluded from his collection. On the contrary, not only did he know their existence, but he knew the authority which they possessed in the church; and moreover he did not deny or question that they should be ascribed to the authors whose names they bore. Only he pretended that they were tinctured with judaism, and he "labored to depreciate their authors that he might secure to his mutilated gospel the credit of which he deprived them." Tertullian says, (Connititur ad destruendum statum eorum Evangeliorum quæ propriè et sub *Apostolorum*[1] nomine eduntur, vel etiam *apostolicorum*;[2] etc.) This is for us in this respect a very important testimony.

3. Marcion and the Marcionites[3] themselves avowed that they were aiming to mutilate the ancient Scriptures (tot originalia instrumenta Christi) received before them in the church. Irenæus has already said to us, "The Marcionites, pretending to be more sincere and wise than the apostles, aimed to mutilate the Scriptures, ejecting some portions and reducing others." Thus they render testimony again to the canon of the church both by speaking ill of it, and by mutilating it. We have also heard Tertullian oppose the canon of Marcion to the canon of the church (auferendo quæ voluit de Nostri Instrumenti integritate.)[4]

4. We hear all his adversaries (Tertullian, Irenæus, Ori-

[1] The gospels of Matthew and John were so designated by him.
[2] He is speaking then of Mark.
[3] Iren. Hæres. iii. 12.
[4] Adv. Marcion, v. 13.

gen, Epiphanius) reproach him, not with introducing new texts, but with altering those existing before his day.

5. Among the reproaches made against him, is one, not grave, yet important, as it shows us the great abundance of study already bestowed upon the collection of Scriptures for a long time in all the churches, and what place it had taken as an organic whole in the customs of the people of God. We have seen that Marcion,[1] while preserving the thirteen epistles which the entire church attributed to Paul, had seen fit, contrary to universal usage, to change their order, and how this change is censured both by Tertullian in his fifth book against Marcion, and by Epiphanius in his forty-second chapter against heresies. How remarkable it is that only twenty-five years after the death of the disciple whom Jesus loved, this collection had become so familiar to all the churches of God, that they had already everywhere the habit of ranking the thirteen epistles of Paul and the four gospels in an invariable order;[2] an order, we have elsewhere remarked, not at all according to the date of their compositions! How can it be otherwise than that this arrangement of the holy Books must have prevailed universally and always, since Epiphanius in his reproaches traces it back even to the days of the apostles. "Marcion," he says, "places in the second rank the epistle to the Philippians, while according to the apostle, it is in the sixth (παρὰ δὲ τῷ ἀποστόλῳ ἕκτη.) He places Philemon ninth, while according to the apostle it is in the last; the Thessalonians in the seventh, while the apostle places it in the eighth; and as to the epistle to the Romans, he places it in the fourth rank, in

[1] We are speaking here only of the first canon. We will hereafter treat of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

[2] In the ancient Latin manuscript of Cambridge (Beza's) the four Gospels are ranged in this order: Matthew, John, Luke, and Mark. It seems that before Jerome's day that was the ancient order. Mr Berger de Xivrey says, It is the only manuscript of a high antiquity which joins the Greek to the Latin translation.

order that nothing should be left where it belonged, nothing should be done right."[1]

Certainly this unanimity of the churches in universally ranking our holy Books in the same order, and that not chronological, in days so remote, is a very significant fact to show us the place which the first canon all entire had already taken in the customs of the universal church.

6. Finally, the indignation of all these Fathers at the attempts of Marcion against the Scriptures, and their very definite reproaches of him on this account, attest to us with what sacred jealousy the text of our Scriptures was then watched over in the churches of God.

But the testimony of Tatian will supplement that of Marcion.

Tatian.

Cave and the other ecclesiastical historians frequently complain of the uncertainty which pervades the chronology of all these heretics of the second century. Thus as to Tatian, whilst Epiphanius places him in the second year of Antoninus Pius, A. D. 149, the end of the long sojourn of this heretic in Rome, where he was engaged in founding a school of heresy, is placed by others twenty years later.[2] For ourselves who are now ascending the years of the second century, we prefer, without attempting to settle the point, to place Tatian first after Marcion, because his history throws important light on that of the professor of Sinope.

Like him he was skillful, learned, but haughty and impetuous. Like him also he resided for a time in Rome; and, after having seemed to belong to the church of God, violently broke from it and set himself in opposition to a part of the recognized canon; but not against the same books. It is also in this respect that Tatian renders to our Scriptures a testimony which at once completes those of Marcion and of

[1] Hæres. xlii. p. 368.

[2] Cave Scriptor. Eccles. Historia Litteraria. Vol. i. p. 75, fol. Basil.

Justin Martyr. Born in Assyria of a pagan family, he at first ardently pursued philosophical studies, until he went to Rome and met Justin, "that admirable man," as he himself styles him.[1] From that moment he made profession of Christianity, and so attached himself to Justin that after his martyrdom he pretended to continue his school. But success soon inflated him, and Irenæus says, "destroyed him." He threw himself into systems of error borrowed from the oriental philosophies; and then returning to Mesopotamia, he became the head of the Encratites, — ascetics who united the vain imaginations of Valentinus to the repulsive theories of Marcion.

We have said that, in regard to the canons, Tatian completes at once the testimony of Justin and that of Marcion. Of Justin, because he cites without hesitation the Scriptures of Paul and John, whilst the writings of the martyr now remaining say little of them: — And of Marcion, because he attributes directly to Paul, the epistle to Titus, while Marcion, we know, rejected it.

Besides that, in his "Address to the Greeks," Tatian makes evident allusions to the gospel of John and to his Apocalypse. And we learn also from Irenæus,[2] as also from Jerome, that, to defend his heresies, he invoked the authority of Paul's epistles to the Corinthians and Galatians.

But still farther, we have to cite from this pernicious man a literary fact still more significant for the authority of the canon and more especially of the sacred collection of the four gospels. It is that, among "the great multitude of his works (infinita volumina)," says Jerome,[3] "the authors of the time frequently mention the important 'Harmony of the four Gospels,'"[4] which he himself calls, "The Composed of

[1] In his Address to the Greeks, p. 18, 19.

[2] Hæres. i. 28. See, too, Euseb. H. E. iv. 29. Tatian, Orat. ad Græc. cap. 42, i. 35, 1819.

[3] De Scriptor. cap. 29.

[4] Epiphanius speaks expressly of *the four Gospels* (Hæres. xlvi. 1).

Four (τὸ Διὰ τεσσάρων)." Eusebius[1] says, "it was a Collection, and a certain Combination of the Gospels."

See then already so soon after the death of John, the collection of the four gospels acknowledged, studied, and laboriously collated by a dangerous heretic who denied, among so many other truths of our faith, the humanity of our Saviour and the reality of his death! Without doubt Tatian had made some wicked retrenchments from this collection; but these alterations do not appear at the first reading; and neither Eusebius nor Theodoret (who speaks of them) gives us to understand that he had introduced into it any fragment of an apocryphal gospel. His book, even in the days of Eusebius, was "still used by certain persons who were not aware of the alterations." Epiphanius tells us expressly that it "was composed of the four Gospels," and that many called it "The Gospel according to the Hebrews." In fine, Theodoret,[2] nearly a century after Epiphanius, in telling us that Tatian had rejected from it the genealogy of the Saviour, and the passages indicating his descent from David according to the flesh, relates that his book was still current in his time in certain places. He says, "I myself found more than two hundred copies of it, in our churches (in Syria), which had received them with respect and which used them, unconscious of the evil in them; but having gathered them all, I took them away to replace them by the gospels of the four Evangelists."

This testimony of Tatian has great value; but we shall go yet farther back in the century, to reach Valentinus and the six different sects which bore his name.

Valentinus and the Valentinians.

The Valentinians, as appears from all the Fathers who have described them, were among the most powerful and the most pernicious of the gnostic sects. Valentinus, born in

[1] H. E. iv. 29.

[2] Hæres. Fab. i. 20.

Egypt, began his public life in teaching the Platonic philosophy; but from thence, like so many other doctors of that time, went to establish the seat of his labors in Rome, many years before Justin Martyr, on the one hand, and Marcion and Tatian on the other, commenced their labors there. As Valentinus preceded these, his testimony should be placed nearer the days of the apostles; for he was already known A. D. 120. He called himself the disciple of a friend of Paul; and Irenæus [1] states that he went to Rome during the episcopate of Hyginus, and that he lived there until the time of Anicet. He was, therefore, in that capital when Polycarp came there on a mission in behalf of the eastern churches, and he may have had Marcion among his hearers. His lessons attracted a crowd; a great number of admirers attached themselves to him, because he excelled in talent, and was a powerful speaker. "He had even aspired to the episcopate," Tertullian [2] says; and it is thought that in consequence of his "ambitious hopes being disappointed he separated from the true church." In the mean time his impieties did not fully break out until after his retreat to the Isle of Cyprus. His principal disciples, Ptolemy, Leander, Heracleon, Mark, and others, founded many distinct sects, held a prominent place in their age, and were in general better known than Valentinus himself. It is with the exposition of these strange Valentinian systems that Irenæus opens his great book of the Heresies. Tertullian combats them equally in his book "De Præscriptione Hæreticorum;" Clement, in his Stromata; as also afterward Origen, Hippolytus, and others.

Now it is a fact of the greatest importance in respect to the first canon, that already in these remote days, Valentinus and his disciples, notwithstanding their most audacious heresies and their most violent hatred of the churches of God, openly recognized the entire collection of the Scriptures then received. Valentinus made war on them only through the oriental fantasies of his imagination and by the audacity with

[1] Hæres. iii. 4, 3. [2] Contra Valent., cap. iv.

which he ventured to found on his wild interpretations the most pernicious systems of error. Neither he nor his followers directly rejected any of the Scriptures; he had the same canon of the New Testament as the cotemporary church. Tertullian says, "Valentinus appears to have used a complete collection; but, by his violent interpretations of the words, he retrenched and added more than even Marcion did in a more open manner, ax in hand; the one perverting the text by his interpretations, the other mutilating it." The fragments which the Fathers have transmitted to us of these writings show them using the Scriptures just as the Christians of their epoch did. When he quotes the epistle to the Ephesians, he calls it "the Scripture;" and, in these very fragments he clearly appeals to the gospels of Matthew, Luke, and John, to the epistles to the Romans, and Corinthians,[1] and also, though less manifestly, to the epistle to the Hebrews and John's first epistle. When Irenæus[2] reproaches the Valentinians with having dared to entitle a certain book of theirs "Gospel of Truth," he says, "only a short time ago," and in complete disagreement with the gospels of the apostles, it was on their part only a gnostic commentary recently published to expose their errors, without their having ceased notwithstanding, to recognize with the church universal the four canonical gospels.

We shall not here embarrass ourselves with their absurd doctrines; we refer only to their historical testimony; and this testimony appears to us so much the more significant as they abandoned themselves to the most crude fancies concerning their Pleroma, their thirty Æons, their ten Decades, and their *Female Œon* or the *Mother Achamoth*. We can see the wild fantasies of this Christianized paganism, seriously

[1] De Præscript. Hæret. cap. 38. Tertullian opposes the old instrument to the new. This term Instrumentum, Quintilian applies to the documents of a law suit; and in Suetonius, Instrumentum Imperii is an "Inventory or Table of the Empire."

[2] Adv. Hæres. iii. 11, 9.

[3] Hæres., Lib. i. cap. 3.

exposed and refuted in the great work of Irenæus, as also in other Fathers. We observe here these very men, in defending their errors, quoting almost every book of the canon, thus attesting without such intention, the authority of our Scriptures in all the cotemporary church. If, for example, we take the fragments quoted by Irenæus, we see them adduce the four gospels (while strongly preferring that of John) and frequently using Paul's epistles, especially those to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, and Ephesians. "By means of an unfair exegesis (ῥαδιουργοῦντες τὰς ἐξηγήσεις)" says this Father,[1] "they draw their demonstrations (ἀποδείξεις) from the *evangelical* Scriptures (four gospels) and the *apostolical* epistles."

But still further, and, in spite of our desire to abridge, we must quote, among other Valentinians, the leaders of two of their most illustrious sects, Heracleon and Ptolemy, both of the Western School.

Heracleon and Ptolemy.

These two heretical teachers must be regarded as anterior to Valentinus, although they have been classed generally among the Valentinians, from the resemblance of their errors to his.

Heracleon is described by Clement of Alexandria,[2] as the most eminent teacher (δοκιμώτατος) of the Valentinian school; but what makes him most remarkable to us, is that he was the earliest commentator of the New Testament in the West known to us.

From the fact that his heresies were already notorious in Sicily in the time of Pope Alexander (A. D. 109 to 116), that is, from six to thirteen years after the death of John, we may judge of the antiquity of the commentaries of Heracleon. And this we know, because it was at the express request of the council of Sicilian bishops, that this bishop composed

[1] Hæres., Lib. i. cap. 3. [2] Stromata, I. iv. 9.

against Heracleon a book abounding in scriptural quotations.[1] The writings of this heretic must then have been published, at farthest, no later than ten years after John's death, if not much earlier.

We can not now know exactly what books of the New Testament were expounded by Heracleon. But we learn from Origen that he had explained the whole book of John ;[2] and from Clement of Alexandria, that of Luke.[3] There are also many fragments of his writings in the Fathers; and from these we learn that he quoted Matthew; also many epistles of Paul with this formula: "The Apostle saith," particularly when he quotes from Romans, Corinthians, and Timothy.

The reader must here notice how valuable are these commentaries on the New Testament of that epoch, as we shall presently show. What must have been the estimate of the Scriptures of the New Testament by the church, when even heretics felt compelled to write commentaries upon them! But still farther; we can see in the very character of this commentary of Heracleon, how completely the church was persuaded of the plenary inspiration of our Sacred Books, extending to their very words. We see this author, especially in regard to the pastoral epistles, deeming significant the slightest variation in the words of the apostle.[4] Surely, nothing better asserts the cotemporary faith in the authenticity and authority of our Scriptures than the spectacle of these miserable men obliged already, in order to obtain any credit, to quote them and to distort them as the books on which the faith of all the churches of God was founded. Would they ever have thought of doing so, unless the books had long had an authority fully established?

[1] Cave, Hist. Litt. p. 47, Basle, 1741.

[2] This Father quotes him at great length, and more than forty times in his own commentary on John. Grabe has collected the fragments of Heracleon on this gospel, Spicilegium, ii. 85–117.

[3] Strom. iv. 9.

[4] See him on 2 Tim. ii. 23. Clement of Alexandria; Strom. iv., l. c.

Ptolemy, whom the Fathers rank among the Italian as distinguished from the oriental gnostics is placed by Tertullian [1] before Heracleon. Irenæus,[2] who attempts to refute him, says that he gave to the gnostic errors their most seductive forms; and Epiphanius describes him more completely, in speaking of a letter addressed to a lady among his disciples, named Flora. There you hear him quote the gospel of Matthew in favor of his heresies, and the prologue of John's gospel, with passages from Romans, Corinthians and Ephesians. Passages from the four gospels and the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, and Colossians may also be found in the fragments preserved by Irenæus.[3]

But we may ascend still higher; to Basilides and his son Isidore, to Carpocrates and the Ebionites.

Basilides and his son Isidore.

In our upward march through the ranks of heretics in the second century, it is often the most difficult task to discover their respective ages. Yet it appears sufficiently evident that Basilides preceded Cerdo and Heracleon. He was the leader of a gnostic sect of the Oriental School; and his son, equally famous, after him, had many disciples.

Basilides had already become famous, in Egypt about A. D. 112;[4] and he is said to have died about the end of Adrian's reign. He claimed for his teacher a companion of Peter (Glaucion, his interpreter). A disciple of Menander, the latter a disciple of Simon the magician, Basilides was among the first gnostics like one of the *enfans perdus* who run ahead of the standard. He had gone from Syria to Persia, where he had circulated, as the origin of evil, the very errors which Manes or Manicheus afterward propagated;

[1] Adv. Valent. 4.
[2] Hæres. xxxiv.
[3] Adv. Hæres. i. 1, and 8; vi. 35.
[4] See Cave's Lit. Hist. of the Fathers, p. 49, (edition already cited.) Clement of Alex. Stromat. i. 7.

and subsequently returned to Egypt, to open a school. He sought to recommend his pernicious doctrines by an eloquence inflated with all the pomp of language. According to him, Christ did not clothe himself in our flesh, and suffered only in appearance. He reckoned 365 heavens whose birth he described; placing *Abraxas* above all, a mystical power, the letters of whose name in Greek form the number 365, and which he used for magical purposes.

Clement, Tertullian, Origen, Eusebius, Epiphanius, who all speak of this pernicious man, have preserved the fragments of his works; and Eusebius[1] relates that Agrippa Castor, a very skillful and celebrated writer of this epoch, had powerfully refuted him.

Now, all these testimonies show us first, that Basilides was in the East what Heracleon had been among the Occidentals "the earliest known commentator of the New Testament," for he had, Eusebius declares, "composed twenty-four books of commentaries (ἐξηγητικῶν) on the Gospel." Thus we see, near the days of John, the gospel publicly commented on in the East as in the West. Besides that, Clement of Alexandria (Strom. Lib. iii.) informs us that his followers sustained their doctrines of marriage by the passages in Matthew (xix. 11, 12) and 1st Corinthians (viii. 9,) and some other errors by Rom. vii. 7; "I had not known sin but by the law." Basilides too, Clement says,[2] cited in his Exegetics a beautiful passage from 1st Peter, iv. 14–16; and we hear Origen[3] reproaching him with wishing to found his doctrine of metempsychosis by this word of Paul to the Romans: "*I was alive without the law once*, (that is, before I was in this human body)."

Thus we see again both the gospels and the epistles of Peter and Paul cited at the beginning of the second century by this enemy of God and the church.

[1] Hist. Eccl. iv. 7.
[2] Lib. iv. opp. p. 504. Paris, 1689.
[3] Ep. ad Rom. cap. 5, (opp. tom. iv. p. 549, edit. Bened.)

We might still pursue this review of the earliest heretics and go back even as far as Cerinthus, or Menander, or Simon the Magician to hear new testimonies. We would cite Carpocrates and his son Epiphanius older than Basilides, and who, in practising magic and professing metempsychosis did not hesitate to sustain their outrageous morals by quotations from Luke (xii. 52), from Matthew (v. 25), from first Timothy (vi. 20), second Timothy (i. 14), and, from first John (v. 19).[1] We might adduce also the still older sect of the Ebionites, originating during the life of the apostles, and strongly judaizing, denying the divinity of Christ, and setting themselves against Paul and Luke. Yet even they never objected to the authenticity of Paul's epistles, or the Acts, or the gospels of Mark, Luke, or John, although they substituted for Matthew's gospel a mutilated copy which they called "the Gospel of the Ebionites."[2] But we hasten to notice those who are called *apostolical Fathers* because they had seen the apostles of the Lord.

SECTION X.

TESTIMONY OF THE APOSTOLICAL FATHERS.

Their limited Number and their Value.

It was in the time of these Fathers that the church, severed from its living prophets, had to commence her march toward the kingdom of heaven solely by the light of the written Word. Their testimony, as we have it, is calculated to give us great satisfaction, but we must not forget how few they were.

[1] See Irenæus, Hæres. i. 25. Tertullian, De Præscript., cap. 25. Origen on Genesis, cap. 1. Kirchhofer's Quellensammlung, p. 419, 420.

[2] Eusebius, H. E. iii. 27. The reader wishing to pursue this subject farther may consult Bunsen's Hippolytus, Kirchhofer's Quellensammlung, etc. and the recent work of Mr. Westcott, "On the Canon," pp. 301–325. Cambridge, 1855.

Although the name "apostolical Father," may belong to men who, like Ignatius and Polycarp, while having personally known some of the apostles, yet continued to live to the middle of the second century, they are, we repeat, very few; and their authentic books taken together, form a very small volume, containing epistles alone, and these very short. There are but eight, or as some say, twelve. Beginning with the earliest, they are; one epistle of Clement, second bishop of Rome, to the church in Corinth; one of Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, to the church of Philippi; one of the same church of Smyrna relating the martyrdom of Polycarp; three of Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, to Polycarp, the churches of Ephesus and Rome;[1] one on the martyrdom of Ignatius; and finally, one to Diognetus, author and date unknown, although its authenticity is universally acknowledged.[2]

We do not add the Shepherd of Hermas, because its date, now known by the Fragment of Muratori,[3] is too recent for us to give him place among the Apostolical Fathers. We will add yet other books which, in our days, almost all, the learned agree to place in the rank of forged books; the second letter ascribed to Clement, his pretended Homilies, and the pretended Epistle of Barnabas.[4]

[1] If we have remarked that others carry the writings of the apostolical Fathers to the number of twelve rather than eight, it is that they add to them four other letters of Ignatius in our day very much suspected.

[2] At least, to chap. xi. (Hefele, Patrum Apostol. Opera, Tubing. 1847. Proleg.)

[3] Hermas, the fragment says, was brother to the Roman bishop, Pius I.

[4] For rejecting this, we have the following reasons, which may be found at greater length, in Hefele (Patrum Apost. Proleg., p. xiv. Tubing. 1847.) 1. We have only a part of his letter, in Latin. 2. The real Barnabas must have died before A. D. 60 or 62; whilst it is obvious, from the xvith chapter of this letter that it was written after the destruction of Jerusalem. 3. If this letter had been regarded as authentic by the early Christians, they would have placed it in the canon, because Barnabas was a prophet (Acts, xiii. 1.) 4. It presents such an excess of words, and so many of these improper, that we can not attribute it to the real Barnabas (the apostles, for example, are there called ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν ἁμαρτίαν ἀνομώτεροι). 5. We find in chapter x. ridiculous sentences and indecent details, which we can

Modern rationalism has made strenuous efforts to weaken the testimony of these Fathers.

It has in the first place objected the numerical consideration, or, the more frequent quotations from the Old Testament than from the New; whence it would appear, they say, that our canon was either unknown to them, or disregarded by them. But this fact alleged by the rationalists has no existence. If you except Clement of Rome, writing very near the time of Paul's martyrdom, and consequently disposed (as the apostles had been) to cite the Old Testament more frequently than to recall the cotemporary Scriptures, you will find that the apostolical Fathers have, on the contrary, made a very frequent use of the New Testament. And even this feature which is used as an objection, appears so rarely, that we are more frequently struck with just the contrary. You may find in Polycarp, for example, nearly fifty quotations of the New Testament for one of Moses and the prophets; whilst, in the epistle to Diognetus, you shall be even shocked at the apparently affected avoiding of the Old Testament by the author.[1]

A second objection of rationalism is the want of precision in those passages in which the Fathers quote the New Tes-

still less attribute to this prophet. 6. The real Barnabas, who had frequently traversed Asia Minor, and sojourned in Syria, abundantly knew that all which is said in chapter ix. about the universal circumcision of the idolatrous priests and of all the Syrians was false. 7. The puerile allegories which fill the vth chapter and the six which follow it, are by a very different man from him whose eloquence led the apostles to call him בַּר נְבוּאָה. 8. It is impossible that the real Barnabas, who was a *Lerite*, and had been a resident of Jerusalem, had written, concerning the Jewish rites, the falsehoods which we find in the viiith and viiith chapters. 9. In fine, this piece betrays an anti-judaism contrary to the teachings of the Scriptures on circumcision (chap. ix.), on the Sabbath (chap. xv.), on the economy of the Old Testament which it pretends ceased, not at the promulgation of the gospel, but when Moses broke the tables of the law (chapters iv. and xiv). All this savors of the gnosticism and the foolish wisdom of the second century.

[1] Semisch. Justin der Martyrer, Breslau, 1840, tom. i. p. 180. Hefele, Patr. Apos. Proleg. p. 77.

tament. It says, they do not quote it either directly or correctly; and in almost every case of correct quotation it is without naming the author quoted; which should lead us to believe that these Fathers had not the same books as ours before them. But this second objection is no more valid than the first; for the examples which we shall produce serve to show that, on the contrary, the language of these Fathers most frequently discloses authors full of our Scriptures, and readers already perfectly familiar with the holy Word. The apostolical Fathers pour out and expand the sentences of our holy Books in their own languages; they introduce them freely and from memory without a literal exactness; they often blend many passages in one continuous sentence; they paraphrase them, the better to adapt them to their own thought; and you see them persuaded that their readers will comprehend them by a hint, and will recognize the source from which they were derived. Is it not thus that the men of our day most familiar with the Scriptures speak when they are addressing others who derive their nourishment from the same bread? A glance at their letters written in circumstances analogous to those of the apostolical Fathers will reveal the striking resemblance of both in this respect. In fact, there is a superiority on the part of the Fathers in this point of view; for we must remember that the only writings of these men of God remaining to us are pastoral epistles, composed, not to dogmatize, but to exhort, console, and relate examples of the martyrs, by which to encourage their brethren.

Such were, for example, the letters of the great Calvin, the man of modern times who has most honored the Scriptures. Take his two hundred and seventy-two French letters, and compare. This beautiful collection, recently edited by Julius Bonnet, has vividly struck us by its resemblance to the letters of the apostolical Fathers, in its mode of quoting the New Testament. We had the first volume before us, in writing these lines, and while admiring it we were struck

with the fact that the reformer himself quoted the New Testament less frequently in his letters than the Fathers did in theirs.

We should not hesitate even to affirm that the very reasoning of the German rationalists from the works of Polycarp, Ignatius, and Clement would legitimately show from Calvin's letters that there was no canon of Scriptures in the sixteenth century corresponding to ours. In the Latin text of Hefele, these eight letters occupy eighty-seven octavo pages;[1] whilst Calvin's two volumes contain more than a thousand pages. But suppose that we had nothing of the great Reformer besides his French letters, certainly the future critics would then have a much more solid foundation for doubts as to the canon of Calvin, by taking any eighty-seven consecutive pages of these two volumes, than modern critics have for their doubts concerning the canon of the Fathers. Could Calvin, they might ask, have used the same gospels or epistles with us? And in these gospels or epistles, did he find the same text as we have? In fact, in his French letters, which are parenetic and pastoral, (as those of Polycarp, Clement, or Ignatius), he does not cite the New Testament even as frequently as they. Undoubtedly the spirit of his correspondence is wholly penetrated with them; but he does not quote them textually; it is as in their case, almost always from memory; it is, more or less, by paraphrase; it is by seizing their prominent feature just so far as it is adapted to their purposes, without regard to terms; it is rarely by naming the author, and, just like the Fathers, by vaguely indicating its place in the Scriptures. Take for instance, his touching letter to Madame de Cany on the death of Madame de Normandie (tom. i. p. 295), a letter almost as long as that of Polycarp to the Philippians, and compare the two. It contains but this single passage from the New Tes-

[1] That of Clement, at most 35 pages (leaving out the notes); the three of Ignatius, 18; that of his martyrdom, 5; that of Polycarp, 7; that of his martyrdom, 11; and that to Diognetus, 11.

tament, and with a very vague reference; "Paul, treating of charity, does not forget that 'we must weep with them who weep.'" Take again his four admirable letters to the "Students of Lausanne, martyrs at Lyons," and that to "the martyr Dimonet." In the latter (p. 367), he quotes only two brief passages, without mentioning either the place or author. In the first to the martyrs of Lyons, who had consulted him on points of doctrine (vows, celibacy, monastic poverty, the nature of the glorified body), he expressly cites a passage from Matthew, two from Paul, and one from the Apocalypse but in the second (p. 371), he quotes none of them, unless it be in these vague terms, "Remember this sentence that He who dwells in us is stronger than the world." In the third (p. 382), none; although the whole letter, in its five pages, is so penetrated with a heavenly unction. In the fourth, one single short passage; "I know in whom I have believed." And again, how does he quote? It is without mentioning either Paul or his epistle; and even by paraphrasing. "You may say with this valiant champion of Jesus Christ, 'I know from whom I hold my faith.'" Reason then on Calvin after the fashion of the German rationalists when they speak of Clement or Ignatius. "What!" you may well say, "only one quotation from the entire New Testament in a long letter written by the greatest reformer of the sixteenth century to young martyrs in the depth of their dungeon! Calvin then had not our Bible! Nor does anything show that, in this short phrase, he intended to quote Second Timothy, or at least, if he intended to, he had not the same Greek text as we, since we do not find in him an exact translation of Paul's words." But, enough. We are all fully aware that this mode of quoting, so far from showing that the canon was not then in existence, on the contrary, signalizes a period when everywhere scattered, read in all the assemblies and familiar to the small as well as the great, our Scriptures were in the memory of all and recognized by a mere allusion. Why not reason on the letters of

Clement, of Ignatius, or Polycarp as we all do on those of Calvin?

Epistle to Diognetus.

The name of the apostolical personage who has furnished us this eloquent letter remains unknown, and all we know of Diognetus is, that he was a pagan of distinction. Most of the learned[1] have for a long time attributed this letter to Justin Martyr; but, besides that this Father was too young to have been what the writer says he was, a hearer of the apostles, the manifest superiority of the style forbids us to ascribe it to Justin, while its doctrines, excessively anti-judaic, are still less his. Others, on the contrary, attribute it to Clemens Romanus, and others to Apollos.[2] It is, without doubt, older than Justin; but it is also later than these Fathers; and we rather think with Hefele, that the allusions of the viith chapter to great cotemporary persecutions and to a rapid increase of the church, assign him his place toward the end of Trajan's reign (A. D. 117), or the beginning of Adrian's (133).

Now, if we examine this remarkable document, we shall soon recognize in the author a zealous disciple of Jesus. He is indeed addressing a man who is a stranger to the New Testament, but we feel that he himself is wholly penetrated with its spirit, and that he is living also in the midst of a people who are nourished like him, with this celestial manna.

Whilst he reminds Diognetus of the superstitious practices of the Jews, given up to the observance of months and days and seasons (παρατήρησιν καιρῶν), you see him borrowing the language of Paul (Gal. iv. 10.) In the vth chapter, in which he is describing the life of Christians, you find paraphrases of the epistles to the Corinthians and Philippians.[3] "They

[1] Cave, Teutzel, Fabricius, etc.

[2] Lumper, De Vita Patrum, tom. i. p. 159. (See Mohler, Patrologie, 165,) and Gallandi, (see Hefele, 79.)

[3] 2 Cor. vi. 8–10; x. 3, and also Phil. iii. 18–20. 1 Cor. iv. 12. It is es-

are in the flesh," he says, "without living in the flesh; they are upon the earth, but citizens of heaven; . . . loving all men, but persecuted of all; regarded as unknown, and yet condemned; put to death, and yet restored to life; regarded as beggars, and yet enriching many; deprived of all and abounding in all; covered with opprobrium and glorified in their very reproaches; calumniated and justified; cursed and blessing, . . " etc.

In the xith chapter, where he is speaking of the communion of Christ, and of his benefits bestowed on docile souls who abide in "the limits traced by faith and indicated by the Fathers," he adds: "Then the fear of *the Law* is exalted, the grace *of the Prophets* is known, the faith *of the Gospels* is confirmed, the instruction of the apostles (παράδοσις) is preserved, the grace of the gospel triumphs and bounds with joy (σκιρτᾷ)."

In the ixth chapter, where he explains the sending of the Son of God, "his goodness (χρηστότητα) (Rom. ii. 4; xi. 22; Titus, iii. 4,) his power and his exceeding love to men (ὑπερβαλλούσης φιλανθρωπίας), (Titus, iii. 4), he says, "He himself took our sins, he himself delivered his own Son to be a ransom in our stead (λύτρον ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν) the just for the unjust, the incorruptible for the corruptible. . . For by what could our sins be covered but by his justice? In whom else but the only Son of God could we be justified; we unholy and impious? O sweet exchange, O inscrutable dispensation, O blessing surpassing all expectation, that, on the one hand, the iniquity of many should be swallowed up in one single righteous being; and that, on the other, by the righteousness of one alone, (δικαιοσύνῃ δὲ ἑνός), he justifies many ungodly (πολλοὺς ἀνόμους δικαιώσῃ)! (Rom. v. 12–21.)

And again, in his xiith chapter, having shown that, as in the paradise of God so in the believer's soul "the tree of knowledge should never be separated from the tree of life,"

pecially in the Greek that we must see the relations of his letter to the epistles which we have just indicated.

he says, "there is no security nor permanence for either life without science, or science without true life; and therefore these two trees were planted near each other."

And he adds these remarkable words, in which he appeals to the first epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, as a modern pastor might do in the midst of our churches. "It is in well considering the force of this union of the two trees, that THE APOSTLE reproving science (*τὴν γνῶσιν*) which does not refer to the life according to the truth of the commandment, HAS SAID, 'Knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifyeth;'" (*ἡ γνῶσις φυσιοῖ, ἡ δὲ ἀγάπη οἰκοδομεῖ*), the author here employing the very terms of Paul unchanged (1 Cor. viii. 1.)

See then, at the beginning of the second century, the epistle to Diognetus which directly quotes the apostle Paul and his epistle to the Corinthians. The author, therefore, had the sacred collection before his eyes, or respectfully treasured in his memory; and moreover, he wrote in the midst of a Christian people familiar with our Scriptures; for he does not trouble himself to name him whom he calls "the apostle," nor the name of his letter. But why should he do it? Was it not sufficient to use these four words, in order that every one, then as now, might recognize the epistle, and place his fingers on the passage?

We now ascend to Polycarp, and begin with his martyrdom.

The Encyclical Epistle of the Church of Smyrna.

We have here certainly one of the most beautiful monuments of ecclesiastical antiquity, as it is one of the most authentic. We shall also find it almost complete in Eusebius' history.[1] At the request of a church in Phrygia the church

[1] Lib. iv. chap. 15. The Acts of this martyr are the oldest extant; but as to the precise time of the event, learned men disagree. Cave and Lardner placed it in A. D. 147; Gieseler and Neander in 167.

in Smyrna wrote to all the parishes in Christendom this circular letter (ἐγκύκλιος). It will be found wholly penetrated with the spirit of the Scriptures. Scaliger, too, in his notes on Eusebius, assures us that nothing in ecclesiastical history has so profoundly affected him. He says, "It seems to me, after this reading, that I am another man." Let us hear the first chapter.

"In everything which has happened, the Lord has designed to show us a martyr according to the gospel (κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον). Who will not admire the generosity, the patience, the love to God of these witnesses who looked only to the grace of Christ and who despised torture." They saw before them the duty to flee from the fire that shall never be quenched, and the eyes of their hearts were lifted on high, contemplating the blessings reserved for those who persevere; eternal blessings, "which ear hath not heard, nor eye seen, neither have entered into the heart of man."

Here then we find from the very first page, not only the hights of apostolical faith, but the very words of Paul addressed to the Corinthians (1 Cor. ii. 9.)

And again (chap. iv.) recounting the sad relapse of a Phrygian named Quintus, who had presented himself for martyrdom, and then, at sight of the lions brought to devour him, lost courage, the epistle makes this reflection: "We could not then, O our brethren, praise those who give themselves up, because that is not what *the Gospel* teaches," an evident allusion to Matt. x. 23.

The narrative presents other quotations from the sacred Word, which for brevity's sake, we omit; but when the venerable bishop, appearing before the proconsul in his ninety-fifth year, is commanded to swear by the fortune of Cæsar, we hear him immediately appeal to our Scriptures (Rom. xiii. 1; Tit. iii. 1). "To you I must reply," he said, "for we have been taught to render as is proper, honor to the principalities and powers ordained of God; honor, at least, which does not injure us (before God)."

We should also read his last prayer, in the xivth chapter. We pass on, however, to his own letter.

The Epistle of Polycarp.

This admirable document is possessed at the same time of an antiquity so near the apostles, of an authenticity so perfectly attested, and of so rich an abundance of quotations from the Scriptures, that it would suffice to refer to it alone, to establish with evidence the universal use of the canon in the first years of the second century.

As to its antiquity, the letter itself (chap. xiii.) shows that it was written very near the time of the martyrdom of Ignatius (A. D. 107), that is, four or five years after John's death. We know that Polycarp was a disciple of the apostles, that, as Irenæus says,[1] "he had lived in intimate intercourse with the men who had seen the Lord;" and that even, as Jerome says,[2] it was the apostle John who placed him over the church of Smyrna.

And as to its authenticity, we have the most indisputable guarantees; Irenæus, who himself a disciple of Polycarp, could not be deceived about the letter, and who speaks of it with the highest eulogiums, both in his third book against the Heresies (chap. iii.), and in Eusebius' History (iv. 14); Eusebius, who speaks of it more than once, even in faithfully quoting from it (chaps. ix., and xiii.) many passages which are still found in it; and Jerome in his turn,[3] who informs us how highly this epistle was esteemed by the primitive Christians, and of the use still made of it in his time by many churches in their public readings.

We then touch the apostolical period, and are confirmed by one of the most incontestable monuments of that period.

Now it would be difficult to find, even in our day, a writing more saturated with the Scriptures. Its Latin translation does not fill seven pages in the octavo text of Hefele; and

[1] Contra Hæres. iii. 36. [2] Catal. Scrip. Eccl. cap. 17. [3] Ibid.

yet you can count in it between forty and fifty citations from the New Testament. All the epistle from one end to the other, reveals a piety which is baptized in the holy Word, and which thinks in apostolical language.

We will give an extract from his first chapter. He opens in the manner of the apostles: "Polycarp and the elders with him, to the church of God, which sojourns in Philippi; may mercy and peace from the Almighty God, and the Lord Jesus Christ our Saviour be multiplied unto you. I rejoice exceedingly with you in our Lord Jesus Christ, that you have received the example of true charity, and that you have accompanied, as was proper, those who have been loaded with chains, worthy of the saints, diadems of the elect of God, and of the Lord; and that the strong root of your faith, already renowned for so long a time (Philip. i. 5) abides even to this day, and bears fruits for Jesus Christ, who has not refused to confront death for our sins, whom God also has raised, breaking the bonds of Hades (τὰς ὠδῖνας τοῦ ᾅδου, Acts, ii. 24), and in whom, although you see him not, yet you believe, and believing, you rejoice with an ineffable and glorious joy (1 Pet. i. 8), with a joy, into which a great number among you desire to enter, knowing that you are saved by grace, and not by works (Eph. ii. 8, 9), but by the will of God, through Jesus Christ."

Behold then the cotemporary of the last years of the apostles who in so short a chapter, shows that he is filled with their writings, which overflow on every side. It is like a man, whose national accent shows itself in all he says. We have just heard him cite at once, without effort, without even naming them, three or four Scriptures of the New Testament and show his readers that there was imprinted upon his memory, as on theirs, the book of Acts, the epistle of Paul to the Ephesians, the epistle to the Philippians, the catholic epistle of Peter, which he expands, together with his own thoughts, in a continuous strain. And if such is his first chapter, such are also the other thirteen.

The second begins with the words of Peter; and though short, it witnesses still, (especially in the Greek,) that the author had before his eyes, the gospels of Luke, of Matthew, the Acts of the Apostles, the epistles of Paul, and the first of Peter. "Wherefore," he says, "having the loins girded (*διὸ ἀναξωσάμενοι τὰς ὀσφύας ὑμῶν*, 1 Pet. i. 13.) serve God with fear (Ps. ii. 11), leaving vain babbling (*τὴν κενὴν ματαιολογίαν*, 1 Tim. i. 6), and the wanderings of the multitude; believing in him who raised our Saviour Jesus Christ from the dead, and gave him glory, (1 Pet. i. 21), and made him sit at his right hand, him to whom all things celestial and terrestrial are subject, to whom all that breathes renders worship, who comes as judge of the living and of the dead (Acts, xvii. 31); and whose blood God will require of those who do not believe on him. Now that God who raised him from the dead, will raise us likewise, if we walk in his commandments, and if we love that which he loves, neither returning evil for evil, nor blow for blow (*ἢ λοιδορίαν ἀντὶ λοιδορίας*, 1 Pet. iii. 9), nor cursing for cursing; remembering that which the Saviour said, when he taught (Matt. vii. 1); Judge not that ye be not judged, forgive and it shall be forgiven you (Luke vi. 37; Matt. vi. 12, 14); be merciful, that ye may obtain mercy. With what measure you mete it shall be measured to you again (Matt. vii. 2); and blessed are the poor, and those who suffer persecution; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. v. 3, 11.) Certainly these two chapters should alone suffice to characterize, as to the canon, Polycarp, and his age; but we prefer to cite also the third, because it is very short, and this holy bishop there makes a still more direct mention of Paul and his writings on the occasion of the inspired letter which they had received of him fifty years before.

Chapter III. "I write you these words concerning justice, my brethren; not that I desire to arrogate to myself any right, but because you have invited me to write; for neither can I, nor any one like me attain to the wisdom (*τῇ σοφίᾳ*, 2 Pet. iii. 15) of the glorious and blessed Paul, who, when he

was among you, taught face to face, and with so great firmness to that generation, the word of the truth; and who also, when he was absent, *wrote you some letters*, by which if you study them, you will be edified in the faith which has been given to you. . . ."

The fourth chapter, upon avarice, also begins with citations of texts from the first epistle of Timothy (vi. 10) and from the epistle to the Ephesians (vi. 11); the fifth, with a citation from the epistle to the Galatians (vi. 7) and some very plain allusions (in the Greek), to 1 Tim. iii. 8; to 2 Tim. ii. 12; to Philip. i. 27; to 1 Pet. ii. 11, and to 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10; — the sixth, with allusions to 2 Cor. v. 10, to the epistle to the Romans xii. 17, to the gospel of Luke vi. 38, and to Matthew vii. 2; — the seventh, with these words from the first epistle of John iv. 3: "'Whoever shall not confess that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is an antichrist,' and whoever shall not confess the testimony of the cross," he adds, "is of the devil; therefore, leaving the vanity of the multitude, and the false doctrines, let us return to that which was given to us in the beginning, (Jude 3,) watching unto prayer (1 Pet. iv. 7), and supplicating God who sees all, not to lead us into temptation (Matt. vi. 13), according to that which the Lord has said (Matt. xxvi. 41, or Mark xiv. 38); 'The spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak.'"

The last seven chapters present the same features. The eighth chapter, and the two following, quote textually without naming the apostle, from the first epistle of Peter (ii. 24, 22, 17; iv. 16, 11, 12); while the eleventh chapter, on the contrary, expressly names Paul, by citing this word from the first of the Corinthians, "Know you not that the Saints shall judge the world, as Paul teaches? And the twelfth chapter begins and goes on with these remarkable words, I hope you may be well exercised IN THE HOLY EPISTLES. And as it is said in these Scriptures, be ye angry, and sin not; let not the sun go down upon your wrath. (Eph. iv. 26.) Pray for all saints (Eph. vi. 18); pray also for kings and powers

and princes (1 Tim. ii. 2,) and pray for those who hate and persecute you (Matt. v. 44)."

In fact, when we have read these chapters of Polycarp, in which the New Testament abounds and overflows, we ask how it is that the skeptical critics of Germany should have taken so much pains to contest or enfeeble the testimony of Justin Martyr, who came fifty-three years later, and how its pious critics should have taken so much pains to defend it. Here we see what the New Testament was in Asia Minor and in the Macedonian Philippi, only four years after the death of John, in the estimation of an immediate martyr-disciple of that apostle, and in the very places where he had resided so long.

But we will also say on this subject one word regarding his thirteenth and last chapter, and we may profitably recall the pains which all the flocks then took to edify each other by exchanging the letters they had respectively received from the servants of God. "You have written me," Polycarp says, "and Ignatius has also written me, that, if any one is going (from Smyrna) to Syria, he would bring your letters thither, and if an opportunity offers, I shall embrace it either to take or send them. With this we have sent you your letters from Ignatius, as you request. You may derive much profit from them, for they contain lessons for faith, patience, and all forms of edification."

Thus then closes the letter of this eminent servant of God; and we delight in recalling these last features, because they show that, if thus early the churches and their bishops were so careful to collect the letters of Ignatius and Polycarp, if the Philippians had themselves asked for them as adapted to edify, it was with still more watchful and religious eagerness that these very churches must have collected and preserved for fifty years the inspired epistles of the very apostles of the Lord. Thus we learn from other monuments of history, that the original texts were preserved with special care in certain churches; and we have already (Book

II. chap. 3), cited on this point a remarkable saying of Tertullian.

We now pass to Ignatius.

Ignatius, his Martyrdom and his Letters.

Ignatius was a hearer of the apostle John; and if we may believe Chrysostom,[1] it was Peter himself who placed him over the church of Antioch. Eusebius,[2] it is true, places him after Evodius. But the "Apostolical Constitutions" (vii. 46) would rather indicate that these two men of God presided together in Antioch, one placed by Peter over the Jews, the other by Paul over the Gentile converts.

However this may be, it is evident that Ignatius, condemned to the wild beasts by Trajan, whilst this emperor was preparing in Antioch his first expedition against the Armenians and Parthians, was sent to Rome under the escort of ten soldiers, to undergo this humble death there. Arriving at Smyrna, he had then the consolation of being permitted to visit Polycarp; and finally disembarking at Ostia, he was led to Rome, where two lions devoured him in view of the Roman people, in the tenth year of Trajan, A. D. 107.

The "Acts" of this martyr, written and published by eye-witnesses, were edited for the first time in 1647, by Abp. Usher. We find the New Testament prominent even on the second page. When the emperor, inflated by his victories over the Scythians and Dacians, saw Ignatius standing before his tribunal, he hastened to repeat with contempt the Christian words of the martyr: "Thou bearest then in thyself Him who was crucified?" "Yes," replied Ignatius, "*for it is written*, I will dwell in them and will walk in them. (Ναὶ · *γέγραπται γὰρ · ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐμπεριπατήσω*);" the very words in the Greek of 2 Cor. vi. 16, and not of the lxx. in Leviticus xxvi. 12.

"Yes, FOR IT IS WRITTEN." . . Hear then the words

[1] Hæres., in S. Ignat. Martyr, cap. 4. [2] H. E. iii. 22.

which, already in the year 107, were uttered before the tribunal of a Roman emperor, four years after John's death! Hear the language of the most illustrious bishop of the East, when he was standing in his city of Antioch before the glorious conqueror of the Scythians and Dacians. Not only does he confess himself a Christian before the whole empire, at the cost of his life; but he declares that, for Christians, everything is determined when they can say, "it is written." This is their rule; and by these words, their faith is vindicated, their course is marked out, and any form of death is welcome. At the hearing of these words, Trajan replied, "We ordain that Ignatius, who affirms that he everywhere carries in himself Him that was crucified, be chained and led by soldiers to the great Rome, that he may there be devoured of beasts for the amusement of the people."

We pass to his letters, all three written some weeks before his martyrdom.

There have been published fifteen letters of this Father, but the unanimous opinion of the learned has long since rejected eight of them as spurious.[1] A dispute still exists concerning the Greek text of the other seven, because there was in existence an edition manifestly more extended, and suspected of containing numerous interpolations. From the middle of the seventeenth century to our time, many of the most accredited scholars, Vossius, Usher, Le Clerc, Grabe, Pearson (and recently Hefele), thought that the shortest was to be preferred. But in 1845, the oriental scholar William Cureton produced a very ancient Syriac version of the letters of Ignatius discovered six years before by Henry Tatian in an old monastery of Upper Egypt. The manuscript belongs to the sixth century, but the version was probably of a much earlier date. Cureton has just published a beautiful edition of it, in aid of which he used another Syriac manuscript of the letters of Ignatius found in the British Museum.

[1] Two, of the eight, were addressed to John; and one, to the Virgin Mary.

The whole is accompanied by the Greek text and an English translation. Now this collection contains only three letters: the first, to the Ephesians; the second, to the Romans; the third, to Polycarp; and besides, we discover in it with satisfaction that those extravagant passages concerning the Episcopate, which thus far have appeared to impartial readers to be a bungling anachronism, were really interpolations. We therefore make our quotations only from Cureton's edition, and shall content ourselves with the remark of Mr. Bunsen,[1] that now all critics reject the old text as not authentic, "with the exception of some Romanists, among whom the learned Hefele alone deserves to be mentioned."

These three letters of Ignatius, after the reductions required by the Syriac text, occupy not more than ten or eleven pages octavo in the Latin edition of Hefele.

The Epistle to the Ephesians, although reduced to two and a half pages at most, still abounds in allusions to Paul's Epistles. It commences in the style of the apostolical letters, and already in the Salutation you very clearly recognize (especially in the Greek) traces of the Epistle to the Ephesians (i. 4, 19; iii. 11, 19; iv. 3); "Ignatius, to her who is blessed in the greatness and fullness of the Fathers, predestinated before the world, to be for ever united in a permanent and immutable glory, elect in the true passion, by the will of the Father and of Jesus Christ, our God, — to the church worthily blessed which is in Ephesus of Asia be abundance of joy in Jesus Christ and in grace."

This style, too, frequently reproduces the very words of Paul (Μιμηταὶ ὄντες, Eph. v. 1, ἑδραῖοι τῇ πίστει, Col. i. 23). "Being imitators of God," he says in commencing, "renewed by the blood of God, you have accomplished the work of the brotherhood; for having learned since my departure from Syria that I am in chains for our common hope and our common name, you have hastened to visit me, who hope by your prayers to fight against the beasts of Rome, and to obtain by

[1] Hyppolyte, tom. i., Bunsen, 4 vol. 12mo. Lond. 1852.

martyrdom a true discipleship to Him who hath offered himself for us to God in oblation and in sacrifice (*τοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἑαυτὸν ἀνενεγκότος Θεῷ προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν*, Eph. vi. 2.)"

His beautiful and holy letter to Polycarp, although similarly reduced to less than two pages and a half, recalls as manifestly the language of the New Testament. "Be engaged in incessant prayer," he says to his friend, a frequent expression of Paul (1 Cor. vii. 5; Rom. i. 9; 1 Thes. v. 17) (*προσευχαῖς σχόλαζε ἀδιαλείπτοις*); "Be wise as the serpent in everything," he adds, "and harmless as the dove (Matt. x. 16); be sober as an athlete of God; the prize is immortality and eternal life. Exhort my brethren to love their wives as the Lord loves the church (Eph. v. 25, 29); let all things be done for the honor of God (1 Cor. x. 31); please him who hath enrolled you for the war and from whom you receive your wages (*ἀρέσκετε ᾧ στρατεύσθε*, 2 Tim. ii. 4)."

In his letter to the Romans, the least interpolated of the three, we find the same character. He says, "I write to the churches, and I show to all that I die willingly for God. I entreat you not to prevent it by an inopportune benevolence." "Ah, rather entreat Jesus Christ in my behalf, that by these instruments (the beasts of the circus) I may be found a victim. I do not give you orders like Peter and Paul; they are apostles, and I a condemned man; they free, and I now a slave; but I shall be a freeman of Jesus, if I suffer (*ἀπελεύθερος Ἰησοῦ*, 1 Cor. vii. 22), and in him I shall find myself free." "I am chained to ten leopards, by which I mean my troop of soldiers; and I receive many lessons from their bad treatment; but I am not by that justified (*ἀλλ' οὐ παρὰ τοῦτο δεδικαίωμαι*, 1 Cor. iv. 2, 4)." "I do not take pleasure in a corruptible nourishment nor in the pleasures of this life; I want the bread of God, which is the flesh of Christ, and his blood. I want his drink, which is the incorruptible love and life eternal!"

But we now pass to the oldest and most authentic monument of apostolical antiquity, to the inestimable letter of

Clement; and we deem it here desirable to give fuller quotations.

The Epistle of Clemens Romanus to the Corinthians.

This beautiful monument, so worthy of the apostolical age, shall brilliantly terminate for us the chain of historical evidences which link the days of Ignatius and Irenæus to those of Paul and the other inspired writers. We shall there abundantly discover all that could be reasonably expected of a pious writer of the age when the New Testament was being finished; for the author, full of recollections of the apostles, of their doctrine and epistles, shall reproduce their expressions of faith, speak in their language, cite, as they, the old Scriptures abundantly which were read every Sabbath in all the assemblies, shall also cite the words of Jesus Christ reported by Matthew, by Mark, and by Luke, but, in quoting them, shall not give himself any trouble to name the sacred historians. He shall often employ, and in their strictest meaning, the expressions usual with Paul, shall even recall to the Corinthians, with a holy simplicity, the letter which they had received from him fifteen or sixteen years before, and shall declare it written by the Holy Spirit. In a word, you shall find him in all respects, such as became that Clement whom Paul, writing to Rome about the year 60, had called his "fellow laborer," "whose name was written in the book of life." (Phil. iv. 3.)

But when and why was this letter written? What is its authenticity, and how come we to possess it? These questions must be answered now.

The epistle was written by Clement, in the name of the church at Rome, to that at Corinth, which troublesome persons were then trying to excite against their pastors.

Origen (in Joan. i. 29), Eusebius (H. E. iii. 15), Epiphanius (Hær. xxxvii. 6), Jerome (Catal. xv.), and others agree in regarding its author indisputably to be the same Clement

of whom Paul speaks in Philippians. And as the Scripture nowhere else names this apostolical personage, and as Paul, going to Philippi (Acts xvi.) had none with him except Silas, Luke, and Timothy, we must believe that he found Clement in this Roman colony, and that he left him there to continue his evangelical labors until about the year 60. But was Clement a Roman, as his name imports? or was he a Jew, as Tillemont infers from some expressions in his letter ("our father Jacob," "our father Abraham," and others?)[1] We can not decide. That he was bishop of Rome, all affirm. But whether he was the first after Peter, as Jerome believed, or the second, as Augustine believed, or the third, as Irenæus[2] affirms, is of little consequence to us. Eusebius assures us that he presided nine years over the church at Rome; but where shall we place these nine years? According to all appearance, from A. D. 68 to 77; for the letter itself (cap. i.) attesting to its having been written shortly after a violent persecution, conclusively indicates that it was the persecution of Nero at the time of Paul's martyrdom (from A. D. 65 to 68). That of Domitian, which followed, in A. D. 96, would appear much less probable for many reasons suggested by Grabe, Galland, Wotton, Hefele, and others. In fact, Clement in his fifth chapter mentions the martyrdoms of Paul and Peter as recent; moreover, he describes in his sixth chapter this same persecution as cruel in the *multitude* it destroyed, whilst that of Diocletian was distinguished rather by the high *quality* of its victims; and in fine, his xl. and xli. chapters attest to us that the letter was written in a time when the Jewish worship was still celebrated, that is, necessarily before A. D. 70, when Titus burned Jerusalem.

We shall not speak of the career of the martyr, nor of the strange miracles which the Roman breviary[3] attributes

[1] Hefele, Proleg. p. 20.

[2] Lib. iii. chap. 3, and Eusebius H. E. v. 6.

[3] Of Nov. 23. It banishes him to the Crimea, casts him into the Black Sea with an anchor about his neck, makes the sea retire three miles before

to Clement. No historian has mentioned them, neither Irenæus, Eusebius, nor even Jerome.

The epistle of Clement which our Reformers long supposed to have been irrecoverably lost, had been at first greatly honored for five or six centuries by all the early Fathers. They unanimously recommended it; the numerous quotations which they made of it fully guarantee the authenticity of the edition we now possess; for we still find them there, word for word. Polycarp often speaks as having had it in his hand; Irenæus calls it ἱκανωτάτην; Clemens Alexandrinus mentions it six times; Origen, three times; and Eusebius (H. E. iii. 16) calls it "great and admirable." Cyril of Jerusalem also quotes from it; Epiphanius, too; Jerome, frequently cites it and says it is "*valde utilem*" (Catal. Scrip. cxv.), adding that in his day they were accustomed in certain places to read it publicly. Photius (Biblioth. cod. 113), too, in the ninth century. But afterward and through the whole period of the Middle Ages it had disappeared; the learned men at the time of the revival of letters, as those of the Reformation, often deplored its loss; until at length, in 1628, Cyrillus Lucar, the patriarch of Constantinople, having presented to Charles I. of England the famous Alexandrine Manuscript of the Scriptures, the learned world had the agreeable surprise of finding again, transcribed in the last leaves of the manuscript, this ancient treasure so long lost.[1] The University of Oxford[2] printed it first in 1633; then Wotton (in 1718) produced at Cambridge a still more perfect edition; but that which Mr. Jacobson has since published with learned notes, at Oxford, in 1838 and 1840, is regarded as superior to all that preceded it.

When this beautiful book appeared, many critics, such as

his corpse, and throw his body on the bank with his anchor, his stone altar, and his marble chapel.

[1] There is wanting only one leaf, entirely torn off at the end of chap. lvii. through the ignorant unskillfulness of the binder.

[2] At least its librarian Junius.

Pignon, John Le Clerc, and Mosheim, suspected its integrity; but in our day all serious doubts have ceased to exist, says Hefele (Proleg. p. xxxiii.), and all modern scholars without exception are agreed in acknowledging at once the authenticity and the integrity of this ancient document.

To show the full weight of its testimony in favor of the canon, no reasoning would be as efficacious as that of simply passing before the reader's eye a brief extract from it. Its fifty-nine short chapters moreover occupy only thirty-three and a half pages of the octavo text of Hefele.

The frank and pious simplicity of this writing, worthy of the primitive days, its serious tone, its elevation and the apostolical purity of its doctrine,[1] distinguish it from all subsequent writings. Wotton in his preface (edition of 1718), says, "It is the style and the method of the New Testament; nothing appears there which is not entirely worthy of an apostolical man." Grotius says,[2] "It speaks of dogmas without subtilties or disguises; it employs the terms vocation and election, called and elect, in a sense wholly Paulinian." And as to its mode of quoting the Scriptures, it is also that of the apostles; that is, it takes almost all its quotations from the Old Testament. When it quotes the words of Jesus Christ already recorded in the first gospels, it is without naming the place; when it expressly quotes from any of Paul's epistles,[3] it is as Peter had expressly done before him,[4] and when in fine, it cites them indirectly, it is often by reproducing entire phrases, but without taking the trouble to name the place where they are found. It often introduces the most characteristic expressions of the apostolical writings, expressions become familiar to the members of the primitive church,

[1] Notwithstanding his belief in the pretended natural phenomenon of the phœnix, and in spite of one or two expressions which might have been better considered.

[2] Epist. ad Bignonium.

[3] His first Epistle to the Corinthians.

[4] 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16. As we may see it everywhere in the epistles to the Romans, to the Corinthians, and to the Hebrews.

and recognized by the whole world as soon as they are mentioned.

It was then very natural for Clement of Rome, writing so soon after the death of Paul, so exactly to follow the method of the apostles; and his letter would have been open to well-founded suspicions, if it had made at that time the same copious use of the New Testament as subsequent writers did; as, for instance, Polycarp. We must remember that in the days of his letter, the Church of the New Testament had yet received only a part of its inspired Scriptures, and that its canon was not yet to be closed for thirty years. The gospel of Mark, that of John, and his two last letters and that of Jude did not yet exist, nor the Apocalypse. And even this "Epistle of the blessed Paul" of which Clement speaks in his lxviith chapter, had appeared only fifteen years before (A. D. 53).

But we can better judge of the character of his letter and of its quotations after having made a brief survey of it.

Chap. I. *The Salutation.* "The church of God which sojourns at Rome, to the church of God which sojourns at Corinth, to the called, the sanctified according to the will of God, by our Lord Jesus Christ; may grace and peace be multiplied to you by the Almighty God through Jesus Christ.

"In consequence of the sudden calamities which have assailed us, stroke after stroke, my brethren, we have not been able until now to attend to your requests and to this detestable revolt, so impious, so contrary to all the habits of God's elect, which some persons have excited in the midst of you. These men by their folly dishonor your name, hitherto so beautiful and so worthy of being loved."

Chap. II. *How exemplary the Corinthians were before their schism.* "Who can have been among you without admiring your faith so stable, your hospitality so generous, your knowledge of the truth so perfect and so firm? Ev-

erything was done among you without respect of persons.[1] Ye honored as is seemly the elders who are among you. . . .

"Ye were all, as is also suitable, animated with an humble spirit, without vainglory, and more disposed to submit yourselves than to subject others, to give than to take. Satisfied with the provisions of God, and carefully attentive to his words, ye preserved them in your hearts, and his sufferings were before your eyes (Gal. iii. 1.) Day and night ye were in a conflict of prayer (ἀγών, Col. ii. 1) for the whole brotherhood (ἀδελφότητος, an expression peculiar to Peter. 1 Pet. ii. 17, v. 9), that all the elect may be saved. . . . Then every revolt and schism ye held in abomination ; . . . . ye were ready for every good work, (ἕτοιμοι εἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν," Tit. iii. 1.)

Chap. III. *Their sad condition since their divisions.* — "But from your prosperity have sprung your envy, jealousy, contention, bitterness, parties, persecutions, the revolt. . . ."

Chap. IV. *From the same source have always sprung the greatest evils for the people of God.* — "Now it was envy, it was jealousy that slew Abel, persecuted Joseph, repelled Moses, removed Aaron, Miriam, Dathan, and Abiram. . ."

Chaps. V. and VI. "But let us leave the ancient examples, and come to modern times, and considering Paul, Peter, and so many other athletes who have contended near our times ; let us take the generous examples of our generation.

"Is it not jealousy and envy that persecuted to death those who were our great pillars (Gal. ii. 9) ? Let us always keep in view these excellent apostles. It is envy, it is jealousy which made Peter, after having undergone so many trials and martyrdom, pass into the place of glory which was his due (ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸν ὀφειλόμενον τόπον τῆς δόξης.) It was thus, too, that Paul sustained the combat and carried away the prize of patience ; that he was seven times put in irons,

[1] He here speaks like Paul or James. Jam. ii. 1–9; Eph. vi. 9; Rom. ii. 11; Col. iii. 25; Acts x. 34.

obliged to flee, stoned; and that having become the herald of the word in the East and in the West, he acquired the noble renown of his faith, taught righteousness to the entire world, reached the extremity (τὸ τέρμα) of the West, and finally underwent martyrdom in the time of the governors (ἐπὶ τῶν Ἡγουμένων).[1] It is thus that he left the world, and passed into the holy place, having been the greatest model of Christian perseverance.

Chaps. VII. and VIII. *The Corinthians then must repent.* — "It is to encourage you to duty, beloved, that we write you thus, and to encourage ourselves in it also; for we, too, are in the same arena, to fight the same fight. Let our eyes then be fixed on the blood of Christ, and let us consider how precious in God's sight is this blood, which, shed for our salvation, conveys the grace of conversion to the whole world. Let us look back to all past generations, and convince ourselves that from generation to generation the Lord has given place to conversion (τόπον ἔδωκεν ὁ Δεσπότης) for those who wished to be converted to Him. Noah preached repentance (ἐκήρυξεν μετάνοιαν, 2 Pet. ii. 5); and all those who yielded to his exhortations were saved."

Chaps. IX. X. XI. XII. *Let us contemplate the examples of the ancient Saints.* — "Consider Enoch, who was proved righteous in his obedience, and who, having been found righteous, was taken up; and his death was not found (Heb. xi. 5). Noah, found faithful (Heb. xi. 5), preached by his ministry the regeneration (παλιγγενεσίαν) to the world. Abraham, who was called the friend of God (Jam. ii. 23; Heb. xi. 8), was found faithful because he had obeyed the words of God. He believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness. (Rom. iv. 3). On account of his piety and his hospitality Lot was saved from Sodom's destruction. (2 Pet. ii. 6, 7.) Rahab the harlot, was saved on account of her faith and her hospitality." (Heb. xi. 31.)

Chap. XIII. *We must humble ourselves.* — "Let us be

[1] Tibellinus and Sabinus, who *governed* during the last year of Nero.

humble in spirit, my brethren, (ταπεινοφρονήσωμεν) ;[1] let us lay aside all boasting, all pride, all wrath, and let us do that which is written ; for the Holy Spirit says : Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom ; nor the strong man in his strength ; but he that glorieth let him glory in the Lord (Jer. ix. 23 ; 2 Cor. x. 17 ; 1 Cor. i. 31) ; above all remembering the words of the Lord Jesus, for he said, (Luke vi. 36–38 ; Matt. vi. 12–15), Be ye merciful, and ye shall receive mercy ; forgive, and ye shall be forgiven ; as ye give, it shall be given to you ; as ye judge, ye shall be judged ; as ye exercise goodness, it shall be exercised toward you (χρηστεύεσθε) ; and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again."

Chaps. XIV. and XV. *We must submit to God and to man.*—"It is then just and pious, men and brethren, to obey God rather than follow in pride and insubordination the authors of a detestable schism. Let us attach ourselves to those who with piety walk in peace" (τοῖς μετ' εὐσεβείας εἰρηνεύουσιν, an expression of Paul, Rom. xii. 18 ; 2 Cor. xiii. 11 ; 1 Thess. v. 13).

Chap. XVI. *Let Christ's humility be our model.*—"Christ belongs to those who are humble in spirit, not to those who raise themselves above the flock. He who is the scepter of the divine majesty, our Lord Jesus Christ, has not come in arrogance and pride, however powerful he is ; but in humility. I am a worm, he says, and no man, the reproach of men and despised of the people. Consider then, men and brethren, what a model is proposed to us in Him."

Chaps. XVII. and XVIII. *Let us also imitate the humility of the Abrahams, the Jacobs, the Moseses, the Davids.*—"Let us be imitators of those in sheep-skins and goat-skins, who have gone about here and there (Heb. xi. 37), preaching the coming of Christ ; such as Elijah, Elisha, Ezekiel, and with them those who have received the testimony," (καὶ τοὺς μεμαρτυρημένους, Heb. xi. 2.)

[1] It is Paul's favorite term (Acts xx. 19 ; Eph. iv. 2 ; Phil. ii. 3 ; Col. ii. 18, 33 ; iii. 32.) And of Peter (1 Pet. v. 5.)

Notice this passive expression, so common with Luke and with Paul, (Acts vi. 3; x. 22; xvi. 2; 1 Tim. v. 10; Heb. xi. 2, 4, 5, 39). "Thus Abraham *received* eminently the testimony, who was called the friend of God, but who said in his humility, I am but dust and ashes. Thus Job; thus Moses, who was called faithful in all the house of God (Num. xii. 7; Heb. iii. 2). Thus David. . . ."

Chap. XIX. *In their example let us also seek for peace.* — "Let us then receive instruction from this humility and from this obedience which so many and such great men set before our eyes, to whom the Scriptures have rendered such testimonies; and let us know also how to contemplate the clemency and the long suffering of God towards the whole creation."

Chap. XX. *Do we not see in the government of the world how God is pleased with harmony and peace?* — "Let us consider, in the heavens, in the seasons, the stars, the earth, the days, the nights, how all creatures are harmoniously submissive to his sovereign will; and let us remember how he is the friend of peace and of good order, beneficent toward all, but especially beneficent toward those who have taken refuge in his compassions by our Lord Jesus Christ."

Chaps. XXI. and XXII. *Rank yourselves then in order in everything before God.* — "Consider also how near he is to us, for nothing within us is concealed from him, he is the searcher of our thoughts and of our intentions (ἐρευνητὴς γάρ ἐστιν ἐννοιῶν καὶ ἐνθυμήσεων as Heb. iv. 12.)"

Chap. XXIII. *Be humble and true, remembering always the coming of Christ.* — "Let us therefore draw nigh to him with simplicity of spirit; let us not be wavering or double-minded, μὴ δωψυχῶμεν" (δίψυχος a term peculiar to James i. 8; iv. 8.)

"Far from us be the evil spoken of in this Scripture; Wo to the double-minded, or the wavering (δίψυχος); them whose soul is in doubt; them who say, We have heard these things also from the time of our father; and thus we have watched,

and nothing of it has happened." Wotton says that Clement here combines James and Peter, (2 Pet. iii. 3, 4, in his reminiscences.) "For the Scripture renders us this testimony thereon (*συνεπιμαρτυρούσης καὶ τῆς γραφῆς*) that the Lord will come quickly and will not tarry!" (Heb. x. 37.)

Chaps. XXIV. XXV. XXVI. XXVII. *God teaches us also continually the future resurrection in Nature.* — Consider, beloved, how he continually shows us that there will be a resurrection of which he has made Jesus Christ to be the first fruits (*ἀπαρχή*, 1 Cor. xv. 20, 23) in raising him from the dead. Witness the fruits of the earth; consider how the plants come from their seeds. The sower went forth to sow (Luke viii. 5); and when he had cast his seeds into the arid and naked ground, they were decomposed; and, from their very dissolution the greatness of the Sovereign Master revived and multiplied them."

Chaps. XXVII. XXVIII. XXIX. XXX. *Let us then attach ourselves to the promises and approach him in sincerity.* — "He who forbids us to lie, can he himself lie? Nothing is impossible to God but to lie (Tit. i. 2; Hebr. vi. 18.) Let us then approach him in holiness of soul, lifting up to him pure and spotless hands." (1 Tim. ii. 8.)

Chap. XXXI. *How shall we obtain the divine benediction, if not, with Abraham, by faith?* — "Let us earnestly seek his blessing, and see how it is to be obtained. On what account was our father Abraham blessed? Was it not by faith that he practiced righteousness and truth? So Isaac, in his confidence, knowing what was to take place, consented to be the victim of sacrifice. So Jacob, in his humility, expatriating himself on account of his brother, and going to Laban's house, there became a slave, and the twelve scepters of Israel were conferred on him."

Chap. XXXII. *It is not by works, but by faith that we are justified.* — "Whoever shall contemplate these facts with sincerity will recognize the magnificence of the gifts bestowed on him; for from him proceeded all the priests and Levites

employed at the altar of God; from him, our Lord Jesus Christ according to the flesh (Rom. ix. 5), from him, the kings, the governors, and the princes through Judah. Now all these faithful men received glory and greatness, not by themselves nor by their works, nor by the practice of righteousness (δικαιοπραγίας) which they might have performed (ἧς κατειργάσαν), but by his will (Rom. iii. 23; v. 2; vii. 18; ix. 11, 32; Tit. iii. 5, 7; Eph. ii. 9). And we ourselves also, called in Jesus Christ, by his will (Jam. i. 18; Gal. i. 4; Eph. i. 5, 9, 11), we are not justified by ourselves, neither by our wisdom, our understanding, our piety, or the works we have been able to accomplish by the piety of our heart; no; it is by faith (Rom. iv. 16; v. 1: iii. 24; i. 16, 17), that God Almighty, from the beginning, has justified all whom he has justified. To Him be the glory for ever and ever, Amen."

Chap. XXXIII. *But let us also neglect neither charity nor works.* — "What shall we do then, brethren? Shall we cease to apply ourselves to good works? Shall we neglect charity? May the Lord forbid that; but grant that we may give ourselves with all our might to good works! He has created us for that. Let us then give ourselves to works of righteousness; that our glory may be sought in him, and that his will may be our rule."

Chap. XXXIV. *Let us live in concord and let us together cry to God that we may obtain this.* — "Let us then, led by conscience in a holy concord, and animated by the same spirit, ardently cry to Him as with one mouth, that we may become partakers of the great and glorious promises (2 Pet. i. 4);[1] for he says, They are the things which eye hath not seen, and which ear hath not heard, and which have not come up into the heart of man, the things prepared of God for those who wait on him." These words will be found partly in Isa. lxiv. 3, 4; but almost literally in 1 Cor. ii. 9.

Chap. XXXV. *How admirable are these blessings!* —

[1] The Greek words of Peter however are not identical.

"Oh, my beloved, how precious and admirable are the gifts of God! Life in immortality, splendor in righteousness, truth in freedom, faith in confidence and self-consecration, self-control (ἐγκράτεια) in holiness! And if all these benefits are within our comprehension, then they are not the blessings which yet await them who wait on him!"

Chap. XXXVI. *But it is by Jesus Christ that we obtain every blessing.* — "Such is the way in which we have found our salvation, Jesus Christ, the Sovereign high-priest of our oblations (ἀρχιερέα, Heb. iv. 15; viii. 1–3), the protector and the support of our weakness. By him we fix our eyes on the heights of heaven; by him we contemplate as in a mirror his pure and sublime visage; by him the eyes of our heart have been opened (ἡμῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ τῆς καρδίας, Eph. i. 18); by him our benighted and ignorant mind (ἀσύνετος καὶ ἐσκοτωμένη διάνοια ἡμῶν) bursts into his marvellous light (εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς, Rom. i. 21; 1 Pet. ii. 9); by him the Sovereign Master has determined that we should taste immortal knowledge. Being the brightness of his glory (ἀπαύγασμα τῆς μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ, Heb. i. 3, 4), he is so much superior to the angels as he has inherited a name more excellent than theirs (Heb. i. 7); for it is written; making his angels spirits and his ministers a flame of fire, while of his Son he says: Thou art my Son, to-day have I begotten thee, etc. And again, he says to him, Sit thou at my right hand until I have made thine enemies thy footstool (Heb. i. 5, 13.) And who are his enemies, if not those perverse men among you who resist the will of God?"

Chap. XXXVII. *Let us be for Jesus Christ as devoted soldiers.* — "Thus, men and brethren, as soldiers of Christ (2 Tim. ii. 3, 4), let us zealously adhere to his irreproachable orders. Let us consider in fact what are, under their generals, our warriors. What order, what obedience, what submission! All are not tribunes, nor chiliarchs, nor centurions, and each one stands in his rank, but the great can do nothing without the small, nor the small without the great;

all are commingled. Hence their occupations and their power."

Chap. XXXVIII. *In like manner let each one of us enlist under the command of Christ.* — "Let each submit to his neighbor (ὑποτασσέσθω, Eph. v. 21; 1 Pet. v. 5), according to the order in which he has been placed by the grace of Christ; let the strong not neglect the weak, and the weak respect the strong."

Chaps. XXXIX. XL. XLI. XLII. *We have nothing of which to boast. Let us submit to the order established by God in the church, and let us consider what that order is.* — "The apostles have preached the gospel to us by the commandment of the Lord Jesus Christ; and Jesus Christ, by the commandment of God. Having then received their command, full of a firm confidence by the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, and confirmed in the word of God (πληροφορηθέντες, Rom. iv. 21; πιστωθέντες, 2 Tim. iii. 14, words wholly Paulinian), they went forth with full assurance (πληροφορίας, 1 Thess. i. 5) of the Holy Spirit, announcing the good news of the coming of God's kingdom." "Preaching thus from nation to nation and from city to city, they established (καθίσλανον) their first fruits, having discerned them by the Spirit, to be bishops and deacons (supervisors and servants) of those who should afterward believe."

Chap. XLIII. *Moses had contentions of the same kind.* — "And what is there surprising, if those to whom God in Christ committed such a work (ἐν Χριστῷ πιστευθέντες παρὰ Θεοῦ ἔργον τοιοῦτο) have established those of whom we have just spoken? Do we not see that the blessed Moses, faithful servant of God in all his house (Heb. iii. 5), consigned to his sacred Books everything that had been commanded him? (Num. xvii.) "He did so because he feared that an insurrection might break forth among the people of Israel in regard to the priesthood, and in order that the name of the only true God (τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ καὶ μόνου Θεοῦ, John xvii. 3), might be glorified, to whom be glory for ever and ever, Amen."

Chap. XLIV. *The apostles ordained elders, and it is then wickedly that any have rejected those who filled the office.* — "Now our apostles also knew, by our Lord Jesus Christ, that there would arise contentions on the subject, (or on the dignity) of the *bishopric* (ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς.) Having then received a perfect foreknowledge of that, they established those whom we have just mentioned, and gave afterward this precept, (ἐπινομήν,) (an expression that some would translate *this testamentary order*), that, when they should die, other approved men should in turn receive their office (διαδέξωνται τὴν λειτουργίαν)." "In consequence we think that those whom they, or afterwards other eminent men ordained, with the consent of the whole church (συνευδοκησάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάσης) and who have served the flock of Christ in humility, without reproach, peaceably and without mingling therewith base pursuits (καὶ ἀβαναύσως), having long had the testimony of the people; we think that such men can not be justly expelled from their office. It would be no small sin on our part." "And in the mean time we see some who administered well, and whom you have expelled from an office which they had filled honorably and without reproach."

Chap. XLV. *It belongs to the wicked to persecute and reproach the righteous.* — "You are contentious, my brethren, and you expend your ardor on things not pertaining to salvation. Bend over the Scriptures,[1] the very words of the Holy Spirit. . . . You never see the righteous there rejected by the saints. They have suffered persecution, but from the wicked; they have been cast into prison, but by the ungodly. . ."

Chap. XLVI. *Unite yourselves to the righteous. Your discords are pernicious.* — "Why are there contentions among you, animosities, schisms, and wars? (James iv. 1.) Have we not one God and Christ? (Eph. iv. 4, 6.) Have we not one Spirit of grace who is shed upon us, and one calling in Christ? Why should we rend the members of Christ,

1 ἐγκύπτετε. Probable allusion to 1 Pet. i. 12. (παρακύψαι.)

and forget that we are members, one of another? (Eph. iv. 25.) Let us remember the words of our Lord; for he said (Matt. xxvi. 24; Luke xvii. 2; Mark ix. 42); Wo to that man! It were better for him never to have been born than to offend one of my elect. It were better that a millstone were attached to his neck, and that he were thrown into the sea than to offend one of these little ones. Your revolt has perverted many of them; it has thrown many of them into discouragement, many into doubt, and all of us into grief; and yet your sedition still continues!"

But let us especially hear Clement in his forty-seventh chapter, where he says expressly to the Corinthians that *their present dissensions are still worse than those which had agitated them during the life of Paul*, fifteen years before!

Chap. XLVII. "Take in your hands THE EPISTLE OF THE BLESSED APOSTLE PAUL. What did he first write to you at the beginning of the gospel, (1 Cor. i. 10, 11, 12; iii. 3, 4)? *It was in fact by the Holy Spirit* (ἐπ' ἀληθείας πνευματικῶς) that he addressed that letter to you in relation to himself and Apollos; because then, too, you were making divisions (προσκλίσεις). Yet that did not render you as culpable as you are now; for they at least drew you towards the apostles (Paul and Cephas) to whom all the church bore witness, and towards a man approved of them (Apollos). But here, on the contrary, consider who those now are who have led you astray, and who have compromised the high fame of your brotherly love, so universally renowned to this day. It is shameful, my beloved, it is very shameful and very unworthy of life in Christ, that we hear it said that the ancient Corinthian Church,[1] so firm to this day, has, for the sake of one or two persons, put herself in revolt against her elders. And the story of this sad affair has reached not only us; it has gone even to those who are strangers to us; so that on account of your folly the name of the Lord is blasphemed (Rom. ii. 24; 1 Tim. vi. 1), and your church placed in great peril."

[1] Founded A. D. 49.

Chap. XLVIII. *Return to brotherly love.* — "Ah! put an end to such an evil state of things promptly; throw yourselves at the feet of your Sovereign Lord; implore his compassion with tears, that he may reëstablish us in the august and holy relations of our first brotherly love."

"Is there any one faithful among you (Jam. iii. 13)? any one powerful to preach the holy science, any wise, discreet in discourse, any one holy in his works? Let him show himself the more humble the greater he seems to be, and let him seek that which may profit not himself, but all. (1 Cor. x. 33)."

Chap. XLIX. *Seek after charity.* — "Let him who has charity in Christ observe the precepts of Christ. Who could say what is this bond of the charity of God? Who can tell, how suitable it is, and to what inexpressible greatness it may lift us? Charity unites us to God; charity covers a multitude of sins (1 Pet. iv. 8; 1 Cor. xiii. 4, 7); charity suffereth long; charity beareth all things. Nothing vulgar in charity (*βάνανσον*), nothing haughty. Charity has no schism; charity does not revolt; charity does everything in concord. All the elect of God are complete in charity; out of charity nothing is accepted by him; it is in charity that he has taken us to himself; and it is because of this charity toward us, that, according to his will, Jesus Christ our Lord has given his blood for us (Gal. i. 4; John iii. 16; 1 John iv. 9, 10) his flesh for our flesh, his soul for our souls."

Chap. L. *Let us pray that we may obtain charity.* — "You see, beloved, how beautiful charity is; but who can reach it, but he whom God shall make worthy of it? Let us pray then, imploring his mercy that we may live in love without human prejudices and without reproach."

Chap. LI. *Let the authors of your dissensions confess their sin.*

Chap. LII. *Such a confession will be well received of God.*

Chap. LIII. *Remember the charity of Moses toward his*

people. — "O mighty charity! O perfection never surpassed! The servant speaks to his Lord with self-renunciation; he entreats that they may be forgiven or be destroyed! . . . ."

Chaps. LIV. and LV. *He among you that has charity will willingly undergo anything that peace may be restored.* — "Who then among you is generous? Who has a large heart? Who, full of charity? Let such a one say, 'Ah, if I am the cause of factions, discord, and schisms, I will banish myself, I will go wherever you wish, I will do what the majority require! Only let the flock of Christ live in peace with its constituted elders!' He who will do this, beloved, shall obtain glory in the Lord; and every place shall receive him; for the earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof, (1 Cor. x. 26, 28; Ps. xxiv. 1.) See what they do, and see what they will do who have the life of God."

Chap. LVI. *Let us warn and reprove each other.* — "God will take care of him who does not refuse correction. And we ourselves, also, my brethren, let us pray for those who are overtaken in a fault (Gal. vi. 1, ἔν τινι παραπτώματι ὑπαρχόντων), in order that moderation and humility may be given them, that they may know how to yield, not to us, but to the will of God.

"Let us accept, beloved, this correction, (παιδείαν), at which no one should be offended. For thus saith the holy Word: The Lord chasteneth (παιδεύει) every one whom he loveth, and he scourgeth every son whom he acknowledgeth. (Heb. xii. 6; Prov. iii. 12)."

Chap. LVII. *Let every author of revolt submit himself to the elders, lest God destroy him.* — "You then who laid the foundations of this sedition, submit yourselves to the elders (ὑποτάγητε τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις, 1 Pet. v. 5), and be instructed in repentance, having bowed the knee of your hearts."

Chap. LVIII. *God bless all those who have invoked him.* — "Finally, may God everywhere present, the Sovereign Master of spirits and the Lord of all flesh, who chose the Lord Jesus Christ, and who hath chosen us through him to

be to him a peculiar people (εἰς λαὸν περιούσιον, Tit. ii. 14), give all who shall have invoked his holy and glorious name, faith, fear, peace, patience, sweetness, moderation, purity, and wisdom, by our Great High Priest and Master, Jesus Christ, through whom to him be rendered glory and majesty, power and honor, now and for ever, Amen."

Chap. LIX. *Let the brethren whom we have delegated be sent back quickly from Corinth in peace and with joy.* — "Let them return and tell us that the concord so desired is reëstablished, and that we may rejoice on your account.

"The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you and with all those who, in every place, are called of God and by Christ; through whom, to him belong glory, honor, power, majesty, and the eternal throne for ever and ever, Amen!"

We see that this letter, in regard to piety, discipline, and doctrine, bears all the characters we should expect. As to discipline, Clement shows us in the church but two classes of officers (chap. xiii.); *bishops* (or elders) and *deacons*, under the only and sovereign priesthood of Jesus Christ (chap. xxvi.); "all bishops or elders being established (καταστα θέντες) with the consent of the entire flock" (chap. xliv.) and each church being exhorted "to walk in peace (εἰρηνεύετω) with the constituted (καθεσταμένων)." As to piety, it is also that of the apostolic days, which consists in "giving heed to the words of God, to live by Jesus Christ, and to keep his sufferings constantly in view." And finally, as to doctrine, we see ourselves led back to the purest fountains of Christianity. None of those errors which so early drew away the primitive flocks, no exaltation of the priest or the church or the sacrament, or of Peter or Mary. Jesus Christ is all, the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end. It is by grace only and through faith (chap. xxxii.) that all must be received, conversion and remission (chap. xxxvi.), sanctification and perseverance. It is to the eternal election of the Father that all must be referred, beginning and progress, assurance and glory. And yet, in the bosom of this primor-

dial purity, we already perceive, and it was necessary, that it was no more an inspired hand that held the pen, and that we no more find as in the New Testament an infallible precision in every word. It is thus in chap. xxv. the author receives as a fact of natural history, the fable of the phœnix;[1] surely a harmless error, but such an error as can be found in none of the canonical Scriptures. And so in chap. v. in speaking of Peter, he places the faithful in glory already before the return of Christ and the resurrection; which no inspired book has ever done.[2] It is thus too that by the side of the purest professions of doctrine, you will find perhaps one or two expressions less balanced, which would seem to attribute to human works that which the Scriptures do not ascribe to them; expressions however, which, weighed more carefully, may still be explained in harmony with the doctrines of Scripture.[3]

We reluctantly omit, for brevity's sake, his continual quotations from the Old Testament. And yet it is his distinguishing feature; they abound there to such a degree that more than a hundred are found in thirty-three or thirty-four pages of his text. That is, three quotations for a page; and even certain chapters, like the epistle to the Hebrews, present a constant series of them. Clement too, like the apostle Paul, often quotes passages by paraphrasing them to make the sense in which he quotes them more clear. But after all, the question for us is not there; and we must, for the moment, omit that apostolical trait in order to consider only the following inquiry: — "What conclusion must we draw from this letter as to the canonicity of those portions of the New Testament which had already appeared at the epoch of his writing, about A. D. 68?" For, we do not forget that at

1 Such as Herodotus mentions, and all antiquity received, (Tacit. Annal. vi. 23. Suetonius in Tiber. 53.)

2 The author must mean in the completeness of their immortal glory. Tr.

3 In regard to opposing works to vain words, he says in chap. xxx. *ἔργοις δίκαιούμενοι καὶ μὴ λόγοις.* And yet, so far as God is *obliged* to keep his promises he had said in chap. v. (*εἰς τὸν ὀφειλόμενον τόπον τῆς δόξης.*)

this epoch the canon had already been nineteen years in a process of formation, to be continued in the same process for thirty years more, or to A. D. 98, when the Apocalypse appeared. The first epistle of Paul in fact had appeared about A. D. 49; Nero, fifteen years later, had burned Rome and slaughtered the Christians; he was not killed until June 9th, A. D. 68, after having decapitated the apostle Paul; and Titus, two years later, had burned Jerusalem (5th of August, 70). Now we know that Clement's letter had preceded this great destruction.

It is then proper that we consider more closely the testimony which this letter may render to the Holy Scriptures already published in the year 70.

1. And first we see at this epoch the canon so received among the flocks of Greece and Italy, that the first pastor of the great city of Rome, writing in the name of his church "to the very important and very ancient church of Corinth (*τῇ βεβαιοτάτῃ καὶ ἀρχαίᾳ*)" authoritatively reminds it of the first of the epistles which it had received from Paul fifteen years before (chap. lxvii.)

2. In the second place, it should be remarked that, if Clement quotes it to them, it is not as an ordinary letter; that is, he himself says, as a letter "truly inspired (*ἐπ' ἀληθείας πνευματικῶς ἐπέζειλεν*)."

3. This first testimony of Clement, were it the only one, would attest already that at that epoch the church of Corinth knew the epistles of Paul to be divine. Thus we might already say (as had been done in 2 Pet. iii. 15) that this church knew all the epistles (*ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς*) that Paul had written, according to the wisdom given unto him; for no reason exists for giving to this first epistle of Paul to the Corinthians any superiority over the others; and it is sufficiently clear that Clement signalizes it to them so explicitly only because it treated of other dissensions which had already disturbed them fifteen years before. And if he mentions the first to them rather than the second, it is because

the latter contained no reference to them. We must remember that we have already seen Polycarp writing to the Philippians, mentioning to them, in the same manner, of all Paul's epistles, only that to the Philippians.

4. No one can question that Clement, bishop of Rome, writing to Rome, in the name of the church of Rome, knew the epistle to the Romans just as well as that to the Corinthians. Moreover, without naming it, Clement makes frequent allusions to it (as may be seen in our extract) particularly in chapters xxxii. xxxv. xlvii. It is thus that, without again naming the epistle to the Corinthians, he quotes it frequently, on other occasions and other subjects. We have above indicated many of these reminiscences, they are there very clearly recognized. His beautiful thirty-ninth chapter on charity may especially be referred to.

5. You notice equally in this letter numerous quotations of the words of Jesus Christ from Matthew and Luke, without, however, the author taking any pains to indicate from which. That was the usage of the period.

6. You there find also allusions sufficiently marked to many other letters of Paul, and to Peter's two epistles; and you hear him reproducing passages from them which the cotemporary churches must readily have recognized.

7. But what is most remarkable, are the numerous and clear quotations from the epistle to the Hebrews. He is no more at the pains of intimating the source from which they came; but he almost reproduces (chap. xxxvi.) the first thirteen verses on the divinity of Jesus Christ; he quotes, with the apostle, the examples of Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Rahab, and those "who have announced the coming of Christ, clothed in goat-skins and sheep-skins (Heb. xi. 37.) In a word, the extracts from this epistle recur at least fifteen or sixteen times in his text; and his quotations are so precise that none can dispute whence they are taken. They need not be repeated here.

8. It is in vain that some have made an objection to Clem-

ent's testimony to the canon that his quotations are paraphrastic and not literal. We say rather that this very liberty of blending the sentences of the New Testament with his own discourse attests with what fullness the thoughts of the sacred books occupied the thoughts of these cotemporary hearers or readers; so that a writer was sure, by a brief quotation, to call up in religious men all their recollection of the written word. This mode of quoting is, on the contrary, to us a proof of the existence of the canon and of the powerful effects of the public readings of the Scriptures. If I were employing in my discourse before a modern audience, some expressions borrowed from those portions of Scripture which are best known in every age; if I were speaking, for instance, of "Him who gives us our daily bread;" "of the God powerful and jealous who visits the iniquities of the fathers upon the children;" of the Saviour "delivered for our offences and bruised for our iniquities," I should abstain from mentioning the books, chapters, and verses from which I took them, because it would be a piece of pedantry to name them.

But we have yet more general conclusions to deduce from the combined testimony of all these Fathers.

Conclusion from the Testimony of the Apostolical Fathers.

We have just heard all these Fathers. They have come in turn to confirm to us the canon, each in his own way; and their testimony, for the establishing of our faith, is found to be always conformed to the circumstances of their respective ages. We do not claim that the entire doctrine of the canon can be established on the word of each one of them; this proof in its plenitude must be sought elsewhere. But what may be incontestably established by them, is, that these documents attest with clearness of evidence the existence of the first canon; that they recall the greater part of our sacred books; that they proclaim their inspiration; that they show us with what submission they were received in all the churches.

Yet it remains for us still to consult another monument very similar to Clement's, in its form and date. It differs from it only in being inspired. We mean the testimony rendered to the canon then in formation, by the apostles themselves, in some of their more recent writings.

SECTION XI

TESTIMONY OF THE LAST BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT TO THE EXISTENCE OF A CANON ALREADY BEGUN.

As Clement quoted in A. D. 68 the discourses of the Lord recorded in Matthew and Luke, the Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, the words of many others of this apostle's letters and of Peter's epistle; so Paul himself, in his first letter to Timothy (v. 18), appears to quote, but without naming it, and after the manner of the Fathers, the gospel of Luke, when he recalls this sentence found in that evangelist alone (x. 7); "The laborer is worthy of his hire."

Thus again, the same apostle seems to us clearly to have designated the first Scriptures of the New Testament by the name of "the Scriptures of the prophets" (that is, according to his style, the inspired Scriptures), when he speaks in Romans xvi. 26, of the books by which "the mystery of Jesus Christ was then (*νῦν*) made known to all nations." In fact, one tenth of the books of the canon was then in the hands of the church; two gospels; two letters to the Thessalonians; two to the Corinthians; the epistle to the Galatians; probably also that to Titus; besides the first to Timothy, and the first of Peter; and it must have been in reference to these Scriptures already spread through all the churches, that Paul, on the point of making his last visit to Jerusalem, wrote to the Romans, that through "the gospel and the preaching of Jesus Christ, the mystery, which had been kept secret since the world began, was now made manifest by the Scriptures

of the prophets (διὰ γραφῶν προφητικῶν) according to the commandment of the everlasting God, and that it was then made known to all nations for the obedience of faith."

The meaning of the phrase "Scriptures of the prophets," has been said to be, the Old Testament. But, besides the improbability of a meaning so lifeless, Paul here declares that it was by these Scriptures that the mystery of Jesus Christ was in his day (νῦν) made manifest; and he has, moreover, often repeated the assertion that the apostles were *prophets*, and their writings (consequently) *prophetic writings*. We think then that the most natural sense, and the one most conformed to the habits of the apostle, is that which we have given it.

Besides, no one will contest the meaning of Peter's words in his epistle, much later than Paul's to the Romans, which he wrote after "Jesus Christ had showed him that shortly he must put off his tabernacle." (2 Pet. i. 14.) He there recommends all the epistles of Paul (iii. 15) and declares that "they that are unlearned and unstable wrest them as they do *the other Scriptures*, unto their own destruction."

See then already, toward the year 64, or at latest 68, thirty or thirty-four years only after the crucifixion of our Lord, all the epistles of Paul placed by an apostle in the rank of *the other Scriptures* (τὰς λοιπὰς Γραφάς.)

This term, "the Scriptures," occurs fifty times in the New Testament, and fifty times it is there exclusively applied to the books of one or the other Testament. It is thus that the canon is already proclaimed by an apostle, and solemnly recommended to the faithful of the first century; it is already mentioned as a book holding the same rank with the Old Testament.

And let it be observed, that the argument here does not depend upon the inspiration of Peter's epistle; and even if we should regard it merely as one of the writings of the first century, its testimony would show us already the existence of the canons among the Christians in that early day, and

the identification made by them of the inspired Scriptures of the prophets of the New Testament with the inspired Scriptures of the Old Testament.

Nor is this all. This second epistle of Peter is itself directly and textually cited in another still later epistle, that of the apostle Jude.

Let his seventeenth verse be attentively read. "But, beloved, remember ye the words which were spoken before of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ."

And what did they say, these apostles of Jesus Christ? "They told you," Jude continues, "there should be mockers (ἐμπαῖκται) in the last time (ἐσχάτῳ) who should walk (πορευόμενοι) after their own ungodly lusts (κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας τῶν ἀσεβειῶν)." And where then do we find one of the apostles of our Lord uttering these words? Only in the second epistle of Peter. We there find every one of these expressions; it is this κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν, after their own lusts; it is this πορευόμενοι, and especially this remarkable term of mockers (ἐμπαῖκται), which is found nowhere else in the New Testament.

Peter had said (iii. 3), "Knowing this first that there shall come in the last days scoffers (ἐμπαῖκται), walking (πορευόμενοι) after their own lusts."

Now this epistle of Jude is declared to be divine from the second century, in the East by Clement of Alexandria; in the West, by Tertullian, the oldest of the Latin Fathers; in the third century, by Origen and the majority of the ancient Fathers mentioned by Eusebius. And it should be remembered that we have found it equally in each of the eleven catalogues of the New Testament transmitted to us by writers of the fourth century.

Thus then the epistle of Jude the apostle, already acknowledged in the second century, itself quotes the second epistle of Peter as a Scripture whose words the church religiously observed, and as a Scripture of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ. And we have just seen that in its turn

this second epistle of Peter, before the year 64, quoted all the epistles of Paul as occupying the same rank with the other Scriptures (τὰς λοιπὰς Γραφάς).

We believe that enough has now been said to establish fully in the light of history, the incomparable authenticity of the twenty books which form the first canon of the New Testament, and which the churches never for a moment hesitated to acknowledge. We pass then to the other seven, beginning with the Second-First Canon.

CHAPTER THIRD.

OF THE SECOND–FIRST CANON.

THE majority of the proofs which, in the preceding pages, have established on so immovable a basis of facts the authenticity of the first twenty homologomens, testify equally in favor of the twenty-first and twenty-second, the epistle to the Hebrews, and the Apocalypse.

Above all, these two books have in their favor the great proof which pervaded all the others; the marvelous unanimity of all the churches during the first two centuries, commencing with the apostolical period. No one can quote, we have affirmed, in the literary history of all the centuries, a single example of a legitimacy so powerfully demonstrated, a single example which approaches it, even remotely.

Admitted without opposition, from their first appearing, whether in the East or in the West, they have the right on this ground to take rank in the first canon. But we have deemed it more convenient to class them in neither the first nor the second, and to reserve for them a separate place; because, although they never ceased to be acknowledged, the one in the East, and the other in the West, yet they were, from the third century, contested for some time, the one in the West, the other in the East.

We must, however, go into detail, beginning with the Apocalypse.

SECTION I.

THE APOCALYPSE.

Its first Reception.

Of all the New Testament books the Apocalypse is the most frequently and powerfully attested in the monuments of the primitive church. There is not one more commented on and quoted from the time of its appearing; and it is not without irrefragable historical reasons that Eusebius has ranked it among the homologomens, at the same time stating his reservations, and expressing the strong repugnance which the Millenarian doctrine excited from his time.

In fact, if as Olshausen says,[1] and as Kirchhofer[2] repeats, "there is scarcely a Scripture in the New Testament which has in its favor a larger and more powerful succession of historical testimonies," yet the Apocalypse is also the book against which, afterward, on account of its mysteries and prophecies, the enemies of the canon and of the theopneusty have most violently arrayed themselves. It was, in the third and fourth centuries, its doctrine of a millennium misapprehended by them that aroused their opposition; but it is especially on account of its incontestable claims to the most complete inspiration, that it has been so bitterly opposed in our day, above all, in Germany. This Scripture entirely prophetic, that is to say, theopneustic, will never cease to be opposed by the enemies of the divine inspiration of the New Testament.

At the same time, we must here carefully remark the nature of the objections raised by its first detractors in the third and fourth centuries. When, after having been so long re-

[1] Authenticity of N. T. chap. x.

[2] "Kaum ein Buch des N. T. hat eine solche namhafte Reiche von Historischen Testimonien für sich." (Quellens. p. 296.)

ceived by all the churches, the Apocalypse began to find some timid opposition in the third century; and even later, in the fourth century, when its adversaries became more decided and numerous, none of them ever imagined an attack upon it by historical arguments, for it was as impregnable on that side as the four gospels. They directed their attack upon its contents; its style, which, they pretended, was not that of John; and its title, in which one said the author called himself *John*, not *the apostle*, whereas the true John, in his gospel, (xxi. 24; xix. 25, 26, and elsewhere) and in his first epistle (i. 2), has fully exhibited himself as an apostle. Who then gives us assurance that the John of the Revelation is indeed the son of Zebedee, and not rather some other unknown writer of the same name? Such were in the third century the sole objections of the adversaries; and when Eusebius, in his turn, A. D. 324, announced his, he no more alleged than his predecessors, Michaelis says, any historical consideration. He did not say, "This book was not acknowledged by the ancients; it has been contradicted from the time of its publication; it was smuggled in at such or such an epoch; it was not spoken of during the life of John; it was not preserved by the seven churches of Asia. . . ." By no means; none of these objections were then possible; and none thought of advancing them, however zealous they might be to get rid of millenarian doctrines. This consideration certainly forms, in favor of its authenticity, an historical argument of the greatest weight.

Besides, when Eusebius seeks for writers opposed to the Apocalypse in Christian antiquity, he can not find one from the days of the apostles, down to the third century. It is first Caius, a Roman priest, whose testimony is entirely uncertain; it is bishop Dionysius of Alexandria, who admits the canonicity and inspiration of the book, but calls in question its apostolicity; it is only certain persons in Egypt, who pretend to attribute it to Cerinthus the heretic, as had done before him, outside of the church, the heretical sect of the

Alogi, who, from hatred to the name *Logos* given to Christ, rejected the gospel of John as well as his Apocalypse.

But, long before these first isolated voices were heard, the unanimous testimony of the churches, during the whole course of the preceding century, had continued to pronounce in favor of this book in all the countries of the East and the West; a great number of eminent writers had not ceased to commend it to the esteem of the churches by commentaries and innumerable quotations; Justin Martyr in Asia; the church of Lyons in Gaul; Irenæus the martyr, in the same city, whither he had not removed until after having long resided in Asia, in the country of Ephesus whence the Apocalypse emanated; Theophilus, in Syrian Antioch; Apollonius, in Italy where he too underwent martyrdom; Melito, in Asia Minor; Clement of Alexandria, in Egypt; Tertullian in Africa.

And yet later, even after the oppositions of Caius and Dionysius had been heard in Egypt and Rome, what effect did they produce on their age? Certainly very little; for the great voice of the churches continued at the same time its testimony by the mouth of their teachers and martyrs. Hippolytus of Aden, astronomer, theologian, and martyr in Italy; the great Origen in Asia; Cyprian in Africa; Victorinus in Pettaw in Pannonia; bishop Methodius of Tyre, also a martyr; Arnobius of Numidia; Lactantius in Gaul, that eloquent African who was teacher of the son of the Emperor Constantine. And it was not only by the most distinguished men that the Apocalypse was then recommended; for the Novatian and Donatist schismatics also expressed the same respect as the orthodox teachers.

Afterward too in the East, at the beginning of the fourth century, at the same time that Eusebius, as also Cyril of Jerusalem and Gregory Nazianzen seemed reluctant to place the Apocalypse in the canon of the homologomens, the great Athanasius did not hesitate; and in other parts of the East, you might have heard Basil, Epiphanius, Cyril of Alexan-

dria, among the Greeks; St. Ephraim among the Syrians; as in the West and in Africa, Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine, among the Latins, speak of this Scripture with the same reverence.

But before passing in review these several testimonies, and speaking of the council of Laodicea, we may settle the date of its first appearance.

Its Date.

The exact age of the Apocalypse is given by Irenæus, of all the witnesses the most reliable, since of all who have spoken of it, none lived nearer the time and place of the writing of this book and of its author's death.[1]

Irenæus, the disciple and friend of Polycarp and of Papias, themselves friends or disciples of John, was born at the beginning of the second century, in the environs of Ephesus or Smyrna, that is in the province of *the seven churches of Asia* where John, says Polycarp,[2] was buried. His birth, therefore, could not have been far from the time of this apostle's death; since he, according to Eusebius, lived to the time of Trajan, and according to Jerome,[3] to the sixty-eighth year after our Saviour's death, that is to A. D. 102, or the fifth year of Trajan's reign.

These are the words of Irenæus.[4] "It is not long since the Apocalypse appeared; but it is almost in our generation, toward the close of Domitian's reign."

This declaration so clear is confirmed to us too in the same century by other independent testimonies.

Clement of Alexandria[5] attests that John returned from

[1] Grabe, Prolog. in Irenæum.

[2] Euseb. H. E. Lib. v. chap. 24; Lib. iii. chap. 23.

[3] In his "Illustrious Men;" see Lardner's tom. x. p. 100.

[4] Iren. (adv. Hæres.), Lib. iii. chap. 30. (Euseb. H. E. Lib. iii. 18). See (chap. 28) the same Irenæus attributing the Apocalypse to the apostle John; and see again, four chapters farther. See, too, Lib. iv. 50.

[5] Euseb. H. E. iii. 23.

Patmos to Ephesus "after the death of the tyrant." Tertullian speaks of Domitian as "having banished Christians;"[1] and of John, as "having been first cast into boiling oil, and then sent to an island."[2] Origen, about A. D. 230, says, in his commentary on Matthew, that "a Roman emperor, as *tradition reports*, banished John to the isle of Patmos . . . and that John testifies to it without naming the emperor." Victorinus, bishop of Pettaw and martyr in A. D. 290, often repeats that it was by Domitian that John was banished to Patmos. Eusebius in fine (H. E. iii. 18), repeats it too at the beginning of the fourth century, as also the writing "De duodecimo apostolis" (attributed to Hippolytus), and the apocryphal narration of Prochorus in the third century; as also Jerome in the fourth; Orosus in the fifth; Arethus and Primasius in the sixth; and Isidore of Seville in the seventh.

All Christian antiquity attests to us that John died full of days in the province of Asia. Epiphanius alone, if we may believe his present text, toward the end of the fourth century, had advanced the absurd idea that John must have prophesied at Patmos during the days of Claudius.[3] But we have abundant cause to suspect here an error of the copyist, since as Lardner says, the same Epiphanius elsewhere attributes to John more than ninety years when he returned to Patmos.[4] Could he have ascribed to him such an age in A. D. 54, when the Emperor Claudius died, since it would have made him seventy years old when he was called, and one hundred and thirty-nine at his death? The Fathers place the latter A. D. 103.

Many authors, in Germany and America,[5] in the interest of certain systems of interpretation of prophecy, have made

[1] Apolog. chap. v.
[2] De Pr. Hæres. cap. 36.
[3] Hæres. 51, No. 33.
[4] Lardner, tom. iv. p. 188.
[5] Dr. Tilloch; Moses Stuart: Mr. Burgh; Prof. Lee; Prof. Lücke, and Guericke. The learned Lardner already had victoriously refuted the arguments by which also Sir Isaac Newton had desired, in the interest of his interpretations, to establish the Neronian date.

strenuous efforts to disembarrass themselves of all these testimonies of history, and to place the promulgation of the Apocalypse fifty years earlier, in the time of Nero.

To this end they have claimed: —

1. That the apostolical epistles were written after the Apocalypse.

2. That the persecution of Nero against the Christians after the burning of Rome, must have been heard of in Asia, which no historian has ever affirmed.

3. That the penalty of banishment to the islands must have been already employed, as in the times of Domitian; a supposition equally gratuitous.

4. That the city of Laodicea, where the seventh church addressed in the apocalyptic epistles was situated, and which was overthrown A. D. 61, with Colosse and Hierapolis by an earthquake, must have been almost immediately rebuilt during Nero's reign; whereas it appears from history that it happened half a century before the rebuilding of those cities.

5. That the passage of Irenæus on the date of the Apocalypse, must have been either badly conceived, or badly translated, or erroneous.

6. That all the other writers who relate the same fact must have copied this Father, although the details of their testimonies respectively attest their entire independence.

7. That the alleged passage of Origen should express on his part some doubt as to which of the Roman monarchs it was who exiled the apostle to Patmos; although the only design of Origen in this passage was, to signalize the moderation of John, who speaks of the persecution without giving the name of the persecutor.

8. Finally (and this last effort is of Mr. Guericke), that the very passage of Irenæus so embarrassing, would indicate the Emperor Nero, rather than Domitian, as the persecutor of John, because the word Δομετιανοῦ, instead of being the genitive of the proper name of *Domitian*, would be simply the feminine genitive of a qualifying adjective of the word

ἀρχῆς which follows it, and would be formed of *Domitius*, one of the proper names of Domitius Nero; so that (instead of rendering, "*towards the end of the reign of Domitian*") we must read, "*towards the end of the Domitian or Neronian reign.*" And that, he says, for two reasons: first, because, if the word Δομετιανοῦ had been a proper name, it would have been preceded by the article (τοῦ); and then, because the adjective formed from Δομετιανός would rather have been Δομετιανίκος. But these pretensions are of no value; for, 1, the Greeks never dreamed of this extraordinary meaning; 2, the employment of the name *Domitius* all alone, to designate Nero, was unusual; 3, so far was the article (τοῦ) from being necessary here before Δομετιανοῦ, we find, in the same chapter of Eusebius where the passage comes, three other proper names without their article;[1] 4, because, even supposing Δομετιανοῦ to be taken adjectively, it is against all reason to derive it from *Domitius* rather than *Domitianus*. We have the twofold proof of this in the monuments of history, since on one side, we read in Suetonius "*Domitia gens*" (and not *Domitiana*) to designate the family of Domitius Nero; and on the other, in Statius,[2] "*Viam Domitianam miratus sum*" (and not *Domitianicam*) to designate a Roman road constructed by Domitianus.[3]

The Apocalypse then did not appear until A. D. 96, when Domitian died (Sept. 18), and when John might with so many others have come out of captivity.

[1] Middleton, in his beautiful work on "The Doctrine of the Greek article applied to the Criticism and Illustration of the New Testament," has shown that the rule of the double article among the Greeks does not apply to proper names.

[2] Sylvæ Lib. 4, — and the third ode entitled "Via Domitiana."

[3] Moreover we may cite Cicero (Pro Fonterio, p. 4) who calls a road opened by the proconsul C. Domitius "Via Domitia" Cæsar commonly, it is true, (B. C., I. 16 and 22) calls the partisans of Domitius, "Domitiani;" This termination is the Latin form attributed to men of a party. It is thus that Servius called the discourses in which Cicero profusely praises Cæsar "Cæsarianæ Orationes."

The Apocalypse in the First Century.

As it is impossible then to assign an earlier date to the Apocalypse than the last three years of the first century, we can not look for the first witnesses earlier than the beginning of the second century. Consequently it could not have been mentioned either in the epistle of Clement written thirty years before the Apocalypse, nor even in the Peshito version, also published before this holy book and during one of the last thirty-five years of the first century.

The Peshito was composed to meet the wants of the numerous Christians of Jerusalem, Judea, Syria, Chaldea, and Adiabene, speaking the very language used by Christ, and who formed for a long time the great majority of the primitive church; as in the single city of Jerusalem they were already, toward the middle of the first century (A. D. 54) many myriads (Acts xxi. 20) and as according to the testimonies of history they early abounded in the countries we have just named. This version which, in addition to the whole twenty books of the first canon, embraced the epistle of James and the epistle to the Hebrews, both written necessarily before A. D. 64, could not contain the Apocalypse, which was not composed until long afterwards. But the Syrian church, which pushed its strong branches to the very extremities of the East, did, however, early acknowledge it, both by placing it after the antique version, and adopting it as a more recent version. Of this we have proof; 1, in the fact that the Apocalypse was admitted and commented on by the most eminent of the Syrian teachers, the illustrious St. Ephraim, born in Nisibis in Mesopotamia, about A. D. 320; and 2, by the fact, that the Nestorian branch carried the Apocalypse even to China. It is known that the ancient monument discovered in A. D. 1629, by the Jesuit missionaries at Sauxuen, in the province of Xensi, and going back to A. D. 781, presented two inscriptions, the one in Chinese, and the other in Syriac, in which the New Testament was mentioned as con-

taining twenty-seven books, "which attests to us sufficiently," says Michaelis, "that the Apocalypse made part of it." [1]

Mr. Thiersch [2] is persuaded of it, from the researches of Hug.[3]

Witnesses of the First Half of the Second Century.

The very rare writings of this epoch, which remain, give thus early their testimony to the Apocalypse.

Whoever the unknown author of the allegorical book entitled "The Shepherd," may have been, which appeared about the middle of the second century and which was attributed to a brother of Pius I.,[4] his writing contains allusions to the Apocalypse, so manifest that we might cite it as one witness of the existence of this book among the churches. He often speaks of a *great tribulation.* His great beast, the four colors of his head, the grasshoppers which come out of his mouth, the tower which (he says) is the woman, the church which has crowns of palm and white raiments, the seal or the name of the son of God . . . etc., — all these features oblige us to recognize a spirit wholly imbued with the book of John. But we pass on to Ignatius.

This bishop, companion of the apostles, suffered martyrdom A. D. 107, that is, at most, ten years after the appearance of the Apocalypse. Are any traces of the Revelation of John

[1] Michaelis, vol. vi. chap. xxxiii. p. 495; Marsh's edit. See Hug. Introd. p. 65. (Ed. 1808).

[2] Versuch zur *Herstellung des Hist. Standpuncts*, chap. vi. And Mr. Kirchhofer, p. 16, in speaking of the contents of the Peshito, says: "Und (nach Hug's Dafürhalten) die Apocalypse."

[3] The opinion of Hug is founded on the passages of Ephraim quoted hereafter. In the mean time Sozomen (H. E. iii. 16) and Theodoret (H. E. iv. 29) say that Ephraim did not understand Greek, and Ephraim himself, in speaking of a visit made by him to Basil, says he had need of an interpreter (Eph., Opera, iii. 712. Edit. of Vossius, 1603).

[4] Rom. xvi. 14. Hefele (Patrum Apost. Opera, p. lxxxi.) thinks he must adopt the opinion of the author of the Fragment of Muratori, which he attributed to the brother of Pius I., from A. D. 142 to 147.

to be found in his three authentic epistles? You could scarcely expect it in letters when the books of the New Testament are merely alluded to, and where he expressly names only the epistle of Paul to the Ephesians; for he wrote them surrounded by the rough soldiers who were hastening him to Rome for his execution. And yet, we already find there more than one passage in which allusions to our Sacred Book appear. Thus, for example, in his epistle to the Romans, at the end, this remarkable expression of the Apocalypse, i. 9 (ἐν ὑπομονῇ i. x.), which is found nowhere else in this form in the New Testament.[1]

As to Polycarp, if we have only his letter to the Philippians, too brief to furnish any quotation from the Apocalypse of John or from his gospel, we possess, as we have seen, the "Narration of his martyrdom." Written by his own church of Smyrna immediately after the event, it is to us equivalent to a testimony by Polycarp himself. Now his burned body is there represented "as gold and silver burned in a furnace" (ὡς χρυσὸς καὶ ἄργυρος ἐν καμίνῳ πυρώμενοι); quoting, to all appearance, the passage of Peter (1, i. 7), in which he compares suffering Christians to *gold tried in the fire.* But for the words of Peter (διὰ πυρὸς δοκιμαζομένου), we find substituted the beautiful expressions of the Apocalypse (i. 15, ὡς ἐν καμίνῳ πεπυρωμένοι), describing "the feet of the Son of man." The form of the phrase seems capable of explanation only by referring it to this expression of John.

Thus too, when, at the approach of the fire which they were about to apply to the fagots, Polycarp offered his prayer, he began with these words, taken also from the Apocalypse in the prayer of the elders: Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ὁ Παντοκράτωρ. (Rev. xi. 17).

We may cite also at this very epoch so poor in monuments,

[1] Other allusions are adduced from the epistles of Ignatius to the Trallians and Philadelphians, but we prefer to limit ourselves to the uncontested epistles, found in the very recent Syrian collection of William Cureton, (Berlin, Asher & Co., 1845).

Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, near Smyrna, the city of Polycarp, and who, Irenæus says (v. 23) was one of the hearers of John and the friend (ἑταῖρος) of Polycarp. He mentions John's doctrine of the millennium in the fourth of his five books, which have all perished. Eusebius in his H. E. book iii. chapter 39, cites some fragments. But if, in the absence of these writings, we appeal to the testimony of antiquity, we find two eminent authors who, when well studied, leave us no doubt as to the use which this Father made of the Apocalypse. The one is Eusebius, A. D. 324; and the other, Andreas, bishop of the same city in the sixth century.

Andreas, who himself composed a commentary on the Apocalypse, which still exists, and who states that he had consulted the ancient Fathers and made copious extracts from their writings, expressly declares, although himself an antimillenarian, that Papias (as also Irenæus, Methodius, and Hippolytus) had rendered testimony to the inspiration of this book. "As to the theopneusty of the Apocalypse," he says, "we regard it superfluous to employ many words to show that the blessed Gregory the divine, Cyril, and men still more ancient, Papias, Irenæus, Methodius, and Hippolytus, have testified to the claims which this book has to our confidence.[1]

Eusebius, in his aversion to the thousand years' reign, seeks to insinuate that Irenæus and others must have derived their doctrine on this subject from Papias, and that the latter deserves little confidence, because he was, as he says, "of a narrow spirit (σμικρὸς τὸν νοῦν), who had formed his system on an ignorance of the apostolical writings, and a misapprehension of their figurative language."[2] At the same time the testimony of Papias possesses a high value, because his personal relations to John would certainly have prevented his attributing to this apostle a book which he had never written.

The language of Eusebius is ambiguous and embarrassed.

[1] Bibl. Pat. Max. v. 589, 590. [2] Euseb. H. E. Lib. iii. chap. 39.

Sometimes he seems to mean that, according to the expressions of Papias, a priest John, rather than the apostle John, might have written the Apocalypse, and that Papias might have derived his millenarian doctrine from him; sometimes he seems to say that Papias could not have imagined his terrestrial reign of a thousand years but through his misapprehension of the mystical language of the apostolical writings. But on either of these contradictory suppositions, Papias, according to him, must have known and quoted the Apocalypse.

Michaelis thinks he has proved, on the contrary, from the writings of Eusebius, that Papias received his millenarian doctrines "from oral traditions merely." But Eusebius has not said this; and to reach this conclusion Michaelis was forced to translate the words of Eusebius (παρεκδεξάμενον and διηγήσεις) altogether differently from Valesius (H. de Valois) and many others before him.[1]

We thence conclude: 1, that the very positive testimony of Andreas concerning Papias has much more force than the hypothetical and contradictory insinuations of Eusebius; and 2, that Papias, according to Eusebius himself, founded his millenarian doctrine on the Apocalypse, — of the apostle John badly understood, or the priest John well understood; but in any case, on the Apocalypse.[2]

[1] Instead of translating, "Having badly understood the apostolical writings," he reads, "Having informed himself of the apostolical sayings."

[2] Eusebius having quoted [concerning the first disciples of Christ] a fragment of Papias in which the name of John occurred twice, and the second time with the title of *priest*, concluded that there probably were two Johns, the one an apostle, the other a priest; and that perhaps the latter might have written the Apocalypse. He adds that in Ephesus two sepulchres of John are shown, and he thence concludes that the one may be that of the apostle, the other that of the priest. Eusebius would have had little claim to the respect of science if all his conclusions were of no more value than this. This very Eusebius (iii. 23) had strongly affirmed, "on the testimony of men," he says, "most worthy of confidence (Irenæus and Clement of Alexandria) that the apostle John had lived to Trajan's reign, having returned to Ephesus from Patmos after the death of the tyrant (Domitian).

Witnesses of the Second Half of the same Century

If we pass from A. D. 150 to the years which followed, numerous and eminent witnesses present themselves in the various parts of the world; and these do not content themselves with mentioning the Apocalypse, they quote and comment upon it abundantly.

1. First we have Justin Martyr, that philosopher become Christian, born in Palestine the very year, it is said, when the Apocalypse appeared (A. D. 102 or 103) and who, converted A. D. 133, fell a martyr in 165. He wrote his Dialogue to Ephesus, and should know better than any other what had passed there only thirty years before. Now observe his words, in his Dialogue against Trypho: "A man among us named John, an apostle of Jesus Christ, in an Apocalypse or Revelation which was made (*ἐν ἀποκαλύψει γενομένῃ αὐτῷ*), has prophesied that all those who believe in our Christ shall live a thousand years in Jerusalem."[1]

2. We have afterward, in A. D. 177, the "Narrative of the Martyrs of Lyons," made by a Christian of that city who escaped the carnage, and addressed by the churches of Gaul to those of proconsular Asia. Eusebius has preserved it to us (H. E. v. 1); it is stamped with the phraseology of the Apocalypse. We there find, for example, this remarkable expression (Rev. xiv. 4), to describe a true disciple of Christ: "I will follow the Lamb, whithersoever he goeth" (*ἀκολουθῶν τῷ Ἀρνίῳ ὅπον ἂν ὑπάγῃ*). And this other so characteristic, on Christ (Rev. i. 5; iii. 14): "To the faithful and true witness, the firstborn from the dead" (*τῷ πιστῷ καὶ ἀληθινῷ μάρτυρι, καὶ πρωτοτόκῳ τῶν νεκρῶν.*) And still this other (Rev. xxii. 11), in speaking of the rage of their persecutors like the beast (*θηρίου*), "that the Scripture might be fulfilled." And what Scripture? This undoubtedly which they immediately quote, word for word: "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still, and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still."

[1] See too, Euseb. H. E. iv. 18.

3. We have also the celebrated Irenæus, who came shortly after these martyrs, to guide the church of Lyons. In his great work "On the Heresies" written about A. D. 185, he comes frequently to the Apocalypse, and quotes it abundantly; at least in thirty-one different passages; calling it "the work of that John, disciple of the Lord, who leaned on his breast at the Supper,"[1] frequently commenting on it, and appealing even, when explaining the number of the beast, "to all the most exact old copies of this holy book (ἐν πᾶσι δὲ τοῖς σπουδαίοις καὶ ἀρχαίοις ἀντιγραφοῖς) and to the testimony of those who had personally seen John."

4. We find at Sardis, in Asia Minor, about A. D. 170, Melito, who was still governing that church when the letter from the Gallic churches concerning the martyrs of Lyons was received there. He himself had written a treatise on "The Apocalypse of John."[2]

5. We have spoken of the "Fragment" of the Latin canon of "Muratori" which is admitted to be very ancient. We there find these remarkable words: "We also acknowledge the Apocalypse, etc. (Apocalypsin etiam Johannis . . . recipimus, quam quidam ex nostris legi in Ecclesiâ nolunt. Et Johannes in Apocalypsi, licet septem Ecclesiis scribat, tamen omnibus dicit. . . .)"

And it is important, to remark in passing, in the last words of this catalogue, a usage which explains and confirms what we have said of the later decree of Laodicea. The Apocalypse was universally received as divine; but "many at the same time, would not, on account of its obscurity, have it read in public assemblies."

6. We find in Syria, at the same epoch, Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, who in combating the heresy of Hermogenes, quoted to him the Apocalypse. It was A. D. 181. (Euseb. H. E. Lib. iv. chap. 24).

[1] De Hær. iv. 37, 50; v. 26, 30.

[2] Περὶ τῆς Ἀποκαλ. Ἰωάννου. Euseb. H. E. Lib. iv. chap. 26. See also Jerome (De vir. illustrib. 24.) Melito had, A. D. 172, presented the Emperor Marcus Aurelius an "Apology for the Christian religion."

7. At Rome A. D. 186, Apollonius, called "The eloquent" by John, and who is believed to be he whose affecting martyrdom is described by Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History (Lib. v. chap. xxi). It names him as having invoked testimonies taken from the Apocalypse. (Ἰωάννου Ἀποκαλ.)

8. At the same time, we find even in Africa two of the most respectable witnesses of Christian antiquity; the one is Clement of Alexandria, about A. D. 191. He frequently quotes the Apocalypse. The other, at Carthage, is the great Tertullian, the earliest of the Latin Fathers, as also the most enlightened. More than seventy quotations from the Apocalypse are found in his writings. He declares it to be the work of the apostle John; he defends it against Marcion the heretic (Lib. iv. chap. v.), who rejected it only on dogmatical grounds; and on this point he appeals to the important testimony of the churches of Asia, and to the succession of bishops *going back to John, the author of this book.*

All these great authorities cease not to quote the Apocalypse of John without mentioning the least opposition, up to their time, raised against it in the church. Thus, even to the close of the second century and commencement of the third, this sacred book was universally considered as an inspired book of the apostle John, whether in the Greek church or in the Latin; in Egypt, in Palestine, in Asia Minor, in Syria, in Italy, Africa, or even Gaul.[1]

Witnesses of the First Half of the Third Century.

We must descend even to the middle of the third century to hear the first serious opposition. It is not until then that some isolated detractors of the Apocalypse begin to be heard in the church; and now they bring no historical reason for their opposition. Eusebius, notwithstanding his prejudices, has

[1] We do not speak of the heretics outside of the church. The impious sect of the *Alogi*, enemies of the term Logos applied to Jesus Christ, had rejected both the gospel of John and his Apocalypse. (Michaelis, vol. vi. p. 468, English edit.)

been able to find at the beginning of the century only one voice at Rome, that of a priest named Caius, who, in a controversy with Prochus, to repel the gross errors on the millennium, set himself against this book, attributing it to Cerinthus.[1] But his attacks (according to Eusebius) are not well established.[2] Hug brings them into doubt.[3] This Caius was animated with a strong hatred of the millenarian doctrine, of which he had conceived a revolting idea from the wholly carnal descriptions of it given by Cerinthus, the gnostic, whom John is said to have combated. But Caius, in the words quoted by Eusebius (iii. 28), does not say, as pretended, that Cerinthus attributed his gross notions to the Apocalypse; he made them, he says, "originate in certain revelations" (δι' ἀποκαλύψεων) which he pretended "had been written by a great apostle," and "in prodigies which he feigned had been showed to him by angels."[4] Besides, the martyr Hippolytus had triumphantly refuted in many chapters of his works the errors of Caius; and whatever may have been his words in Rome, words unknown to us, they certainly produced a very faint impression there, since Rome, as well as the Western churches, has never ceased to recognize this Scripture as an inspired book.

It would appear also from some remarks of Dionysius of Alexandria,[5] quoted by Eusebius (vii. 25), that in Egypt, a quarter of a century after Caius, some anonymous persons, before the days of Dionysius (the Alogi) might have rejected the Apocalypse, and might have shown the absurd boldness of attributing it to Cerinthus; — absurd, I say, since there is not a sacred book more opposed to the peculiar opinions of Cerinthus than the Apocalypse, as Lardner has proved.[6]

1 H. E. Lib iii. 28; Lib. vii. 25.

2 Michaelis, Edit. Fr. tom. iv. p. 528 to 540.

3 See his Introduction.

4 Δι' ἀποκαλύψεων ὡς ὑπὸ ἀποστόλου μεγάλου γεγραμμένων, τεραλογίας ἡμῖν ὡς δι' ἀγγέλων αὐτῷ δεδειγμένας ψευδομένος.

5 τινὲς μὲν οὖν τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν, says Dionysius.

6 Vol. ii. (4to.) p. 700.

Eusebius again forty years after Caius, toward the middle of the third century, mentions in Egypt the first man truly notable, who had raised his voice, not against the canonicity or the divine inspiration of the Apocalypse (for he acknowledged both), but solely against its apostolicity. It was Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria from A. D. 247 to 264, the time of his death; a man learned and justly respected, but of whose numerous works we have now nothing but some fragments preserved in Eusebius's history.[1] In the mean time, what is remarkable, Dionysius, to justify his prejudices against the *Johannity* (if the term may be allowed) of the Apocalypse, has not been able, as we have just seen, to allege a single historical argument, and was obliged to content himself with saying that "some before him had rejected it, attributing it to Cerinthus." And certainly, that so learned a man was not able to advance a historical objection, is a fact which Michaelis,[2] in his impartiality, declares to "have great weight."

See then what are almost the sole reasons which Dionysius has alleged to establish his position that another John, a disciple equally inspired, wrote the Apocalypse; for instance, John Mark (cousin of Barnabas), "or rather, some other John, living in the province of Asia;" "for," he says, "they still show near Ephesus two sepulchers marked alike with the name of John."

It is, in the first place, that the author of the Apocalypse calls himself John more than once, whereas the apostle has never thus named himself in either his gospel or his epistles. Secondly, in naming himself John, he does not call himself an *apostle*. Thirdly, there is no mention of the epistles of John in the Apocalypse, nor of the Apocalypse in the epistles. Fourthly, there are striking resemblances between the three epistles of John and his gospel, while there is none between these books and the Apocalypse. Fifthly,

[1] Lib. vii. chaps. 20, 22, 25, 26; Lib. vi. 45, 46; (especially Lib. vii. 25.)
[2] Chap. xxxii., 2 vol.; vi. p. 484.

whilst the Greek of these books is very correct, that of the Apocalypse is not.

Of all these objections, none has much weight except that which is founded on the difference of styles. But every one knows how much, in this respect, the various productions of an author frequently differ from each other, according to the subject he is treating, the epochs of his writing, and other circumstances. Who has not made this remark in regard to the sacred authors of the Old and the New Testaments, according as they are narrating, exhorting, or predicting? Let any one, for instance, compare Moses in his narratives with Moses in his last song (Deut. xxxii.); Isaiah in his historical chapters (xxxvi. to xxxviii.), with Isaiah in his prophetic poetry; Paul in his epistle to the Romans with Paul in his epistle to Philemon.

Thus Dionysius, after having exposed his prejudices against the Apocalypse, takes pains to add that "*as for him, he durst not reject it, so many brethren being ardently attached to it.*"[1] And if he takes the pains to show that its author was John, a son of Zebedee, he by no means denies "its inspiration." "That John, whoever he may have been, author of the Apocalypse, had a divine revelation; that he received from above a knowledge and a prophecy; is what I do not deny.[2] . . And I admit with the others that he must have been a holy man inspired of God" (*ἁγίου μὲν γὰρ εἶναί τινος καὶ θεοπνεύστου συναινῶ.*)

Thus then, we must not rank Dionysius of Alexandria among even the adversaries of the Apocalypse, I mean of its canonicity and its inspiration, but only of its apostolicity; and even with a great deal of reserve and doubt. And if, after Dionysius, the doubters became for a time more numerous and bolder, yet they never appealed to history; so that

[1] Ἐγὼ δὲ ἀθετῆσαι μὲν οὐκ ἂν τολμήσαιμι τὸ βιβλίον, πολλῶν αὐτὸ διὰ σπουδῆς ἐχόντων ἀδελφῶν.

[2] Τούτῳ δὲ ἀποκάλυψιν ἑωρακέναι, καὶ γνῶσιν εἰληφέναι καὶ προφητείαν, οὐκ ἀντερῶ.

their objections have no more weight with us than if they were living in our day.

Now, whilst in this first half of the third century, Eusebius found these isolated doubts so reservedly uttered, he saw still coming down from the earliest period, that long chain of witnesses; which we have seen commencing in the days of the apostles, and which continued to unfold itself with great distinctness particularly in three of the most pious, and what is here of chief consequence, of the most learned writers of Christian antiquity, all three martyrs or sons of martyrs; the one in Asia, at Rome, and in Arabia; the other in Palestine; and the third in Carthage, who fully and strongly expressed their veneration for the Apocalypse. The first, Hippolytus, one of the most learned men of antiquity, no less celebrated in mathematics and astronomy than in sacred learning, was an intimate friend of Origen. He taught both in the East and the West, for after having been, as is supposed, bishop of Aden[1] in Arabia, he came to the Capital of the Empire, about A. D. 235, labored there a long time, and even, as is believed, underwent martyrdom there.[2] Now this great man was not satisfied with frequently quoting the Apocalypse as one of the inspired books of the apostle John. He wrote a commentary on it frequently quoted by the ancients,[3] and particularly devoted some chapters to a refutation of the errors of Caius. The testimony of a man so learned and pious is of such importance that Michaelis attributes principally to his influence the universal acceptance of the Apocalypse in the Christian church. In his book "on Christ and

[1] Portus Romanus. This fact maintained by Cave (Hist. Litt. Sæculum Novatianum) is utterly rejected by Mr. Bunsen. (See his Hippolytus). But the arguments of Cave remain, and we do not think he has been refuted.

[2] There was at least in his day one bishop Hippolytus who was martyred for the kingdom of God. There was found, in 1551, near the walls of Rome, a curious marble erected to his memory, and bearing the list of his works, so greatly were they respected, (Cave, ibid).

[3] Among others, Andreas, bishop of Cesarea, A. D. 520, and Jacob the Syrian, bishop of Odessa, A. D. 651, (Michaelis, p. 479).

Antichrist" (in seventy brief chapters), a book still extant, he says, "John saw in the Island of Patmos terrible mysteries. Tell me then, O John, thou apostle and disciple of Christ, what hast thou seen of Babylon?"

The second witness, yet more illustrious, is Origen, in the first half of the third century. There is, in fact, no authority so great in antiquity, in regard to sacred criticism. At the end of the second century he was fifteen years old, and died A. D. 253. Now, this learned man, says Michaelis, "received, opposed as he was to the doctrine of the Millenarians, the Apocalypse as being in the canon of the inspired Scriptures." He entertained no doubt of its authenticity as the work of John the son of Zebedee. In his Commentary on John, he calls this apostle, on account of the Apocalypse (διὰ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως), "the apostle, evangelist, and prophet." He makes such frequent mention of this sacred book in his writings, that it would be superfluous to accumulate instances here. "What shall we say of John, who leaned his head on Jesus' bosom?" he exclaims in one passage found in Eusebius;[1] "for, not only has he left us a gospel, declaring that he might write so many that the world could not contain them; but he has also written the Apocalypse[2] in which he was ordered to seal the things which the seven thunders had revealed, and not to write them." Also the learned Doctor Lücke, a modern opponent of the Apocalypse, has had the candor to say, "It is a weighty fact against us that Origen often quotes this book as from the apostle John, — he who had made so many researches on the canon of the New Testament, on its limits and its classifications, and who never conceals the objections raised against a book."

The third of our witnesses at this remote epoch, is in Latin Africa, the cotemporary of Origen, the martyr of Carthage, the learned and pious Cyprian. When he quotes the

[1] H. E. Lib. vi. chap. 25. See, also, other quotations which are remarkable, in Kirchhofer, 1842, p. 309.

[2] Ἔγραψε δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν.

Apocalypse, it is as a work of John,[1] as a book of the Holy Scripture,[2] as a writing inspired of God.[3]

Witnesses of the Second Half of the Third Century.

We see no new adversary of any importance appearing in this latter portion of the century, and we find everywhere, on the contrary, the Apocalypse received into the canon as an apostolical writing, as well by the doctors of the schismatic churches, Novatians, and Donatists,[4] as by the eminent writers then in the universal church; I mean, by Victorinus, bishop of Pettaw, who suffered martyrdom under Diocletian, and who had even written a commentary on the Apocalypse;[5] by Methodius, his cotemporary, bishop of Tyre, and also a martyr;[6] by Arnobius of Numidia, the illustrious apologist for the Christian religion, in his commentary on the CII. Psalm;[7] in fine, by the learned Lactantius, his disciple, to whom the emperor Constantine committed the education of his son, and who, it is said, died A. D. 325.[8]

Thus then, from the first appearing of the Apocalypse, has continued the long chain of testimonies rendered by the most brilliant lights of the church to its authenticity, its inspiration, its apostolicity. These testimonies were equally brilliant in the East and the West; they were proclaimed in the North as far as Pannonia and in Gaul, and southward in Italy, Asia Minor, Palestine, Egypt, Arabia, Proconsular Africa. And if at the same time, some isolated voices, less approbatory, hesitating, or opposed, were heard, not as to the divine

1 De bono patient. He quotes there Rev. xix. 10.
2 De Eleemos. He there quotes Rev. iii. 17.
3 He quotes also, Rev. xvii. 15.
4 Lardner, iii. 121, 565. Edit. 4to.
5 Ibid. p. 163.
6 Ibid. p. 181, 198.
7 Ibid. p. 480. If, at least, his commentaries on the Psalms are not due to Arnobius 2d. (Cave, Hist. Litt. tom. i. p. 161.)
8 Instit. vii. 17. Epitome, chaps. 42, 73, 74.

origin of the book, but the authorship, these voices, none the less, add new weight to our argument, since they attest the absolute impossibility of any production by the enemies of a historical ground of opposition.

Witnesses of the fourth Century.

The voices of this fourth century, apart from the hesitations of Eusebius and the silence of Cyril, Gregory, and Chrysostom, were very strong, and secured the unanimous readoption of the Apocalypse by all the parts of the universal church.

Among the Latins all the great doctors of the epoch rendered it their testimony; Ambrose, in Milan; Jerome, in Rome, and afterwards in the East;[1] Augustine, in Proconsular Africa, whence his writings immediately on their appearing, spread like the light; Rufinus, in Venice, in the East, and in Rome.[2]

Among the Syrians, it had for a witness Ephraim, the most eminent of all their doctors,[3] although it was not found in their Peshito version, already made before the death of John. Ephraim used all the books of the New Testament, as well in those works which we still have in Greek, as in those written in Syriac.[4] He says, for instance, "John saw in his Apocalypse a great and wonderful book secured by seven seals." And again (ii. 342): "The day of the Lord is a thief." (Rev. iii. 3; xvi. 15.) Now, these Syriac churches extended throughout the East, to Tartary and even to China. The famous monument discovered by the Jesuits

[1] Apocal. Johan. he said in his letter to Paulinus, has as many sacraments as words. (Opp. tom. iv. p. 576.)

[2] "Johannis epist. tres" "Apocalypsis Johannis," he says. "Hæc sunt quæ Patres inter Canonem concluserunt; ex quibus fidei nostræ assertiones constare voluerunt." Expos. in Symbol. Apostolor. p. 26; apud Cyprianum.

[3] See Michaelis, p. 495. Lardner, iv. 313, 4to.

[4] Oper. Syr. ii. p. 232.

at Sanxuen,[1] in the province of Xensi, and dated A. D. 781, bore in its two inscriptions, Chinese and Syriac, a reference to the New Testament as containing twenty-seven books; which, as Michaelis observes, shows that for those churches the Apocalypse was a part of the New Testament.

Among the Greeks, the most distinguished writers of this century equally revered it as a Scripture inspired of God. Athanasius, among others, who quoted it often, and who, in his "Festal Epistle," gives us absolutely the same catalogue with the churches of our day; Epiphanius; Basil the Great, who quotes it in his second book against Eunonius,[2] and who is named by Arethas as recognizing its inspiration; Cyril, the patriarch of Alexandria. Thus we see that Eusebius has not dared, in his chapter on the canon (H. E. iii. 25), to omit it from the list of uncontested books. He says, "We must still rank there (*τακτέον*) if it seems well to you (*εἰ φανείη*) the Apocalypse of John, which, as I have said, some reject, and others place among the uncontested books." Eusebius, sometimes favorable, sometimes hesitating, partakes of the prejudice of his day against the chiliasm attributed to the Apocalypse; but he recognizes with sufficient frankness that the historical testimonies of the ancients are favorable to it.

Cyril of Jerusalem appears to have hesitated like Eusebius on this point; for, if he has not mentioned the Apocalypse in the catalogue we find in his fourth catechism, yet he quotes it very clearly three times (Rev. xii. and xvii.) in his xv. catechism, chap. ii. 13, 27.[3] And we must say as much, we think, of Gregory Nazianzen and of Chrysostom; for both, while, as it appears, receiving the Apocalypse, have, like Calvin in modern times, refrained from commenting on it, and have but rarely quoted it, so that their opinion of it still is matter of dispute.

[1] And discovered again in 1850 by the research of the Protestant bishop of Shanghai. North China Herald, — The Record, 31 March, 1851.

[2] Lardner, iv. 279; v. 13.

[3] See M. Stuart on Apoc. i. 361. Elliott, Hor. Apoc. p. 32, 3d edit.

In fact, as to Gregory Nazianzen, although in the verses of his xxxiii. song he has not, as we have said, directly named the Revelation of John, yet we there perceive, in verse 24th, this apostle quite distinctly designated as the author of the Apocalypse, when he calls him "the great herald who has traversed the heavens." Κήρυξ μέγας οὐρανοφοίτης. Moreover, in another of his writings which remain, Lardner says, Gregory twice clearly quotes the Apocalypse;[1] and Andreas of Cesarea, not only indicates him as one of the Fathers who have acknowledged it, but he himself quotes it frequently.[2]

And as to Chrysostom, although he almost never quotes the Apocalypse, yet we find him, in the beginning of his commentary on the epistle to the Ephesians, making an evident allusion to it, when he names John "the blessed evangelist who was banished to the neighborhood of Ephesus and who finished his days there." And Professor Lücke[3] shows with Wetstein and Schmid, many passages of the Homilies of Chrysostom on Matthew, in which this Father evidently borrows from the Apocalypse; which seems, he says, to confirm the assertion of Suidas. "Chrysostom receives both the three epistles of John and his Apocalypse;" and shows how little we should rely on negative arguments taken from the absence or infrequency of certain quotations in certain authors.

In this same century, as we have said, two councils which constructed catalogues of the Holy Scriptures, have been placed against each other; that of Laodicea in Phrygia, A. D. 367, excluding the Apocalypse from the canon; that of Carthage, A. D. 397, admitting it. But we have shown in our first chapter (sect. xii.), that the authenticity of the decrees of both on this subject is seriously doubted; and that even

1 Once he says: Ὡς Ἰωάννης διδάσκει με διὰ τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως. A second time he quotes this verse: Καὶ ὁ ὤν, καὶ ὁ ἦν, καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ὁ Παντοκράτωρ.

2 In his commentary on the Apoc., see Lardner v. 5.

3 Lücke, Einleitung, p. 337.

if this authenticity be admitted, the Fathers had no intention to determine authoritatively which are the inspired books of the two Testaments; but only to decide, as is expressly declared in this decree,[1] what books might be *usefully read in the public assemblies of the church, and what might not.*

Thus, while in the council of Laodicea, the divine, but mystic book of the Apocalypse was excepted from this number, as our Episcopal brethren now do from the calendar and the preface of their liturgy, although they recognize its canonicity; the council of Carthage, on the contrary, decided to permit the public reading, not only of inspired and canonical books, but also of some other books respected for their doctrine and their antiquity, which were, therefore, denominated *ecclesiastical*, and sometimes, but more rarely, *regular* (that is, a rule of practice, if not of faith), and in regard to which the practice of one church might differ from that of another.[2]

Thus, then, the Apocalypse, during the first three centuries following its appearing in the church, — I mean, during the second, third, and fourth centuries, — was received as divine; and although Dionysius of Alexandria, in the third century, expressed some doubts about, not its canonicity, but its apos-

[1] Quia a Patribus (says the Carthage decree) ista accepimus *in Ecclesia* LEGENDA. Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ (says that of Laodicea) *ἰδιωτικοὺς ψαλμοὺς* (plebeios psalmos) ΔΕΓΕΣΘΑΙ ΕΝ ΤΗ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ, *ἢ βιβλία οὐ κανόνιστα, ἀλλὰ μόνα τὰ κανόνιστα.* It is the 59th canon of the council, or 63d in Codex Can. Eccl. Univ.

[2] Cosin Hist. of Canon, A. D. 419 (Lond. 1683); Westcott, Hist. of Canon of N. T. (Cambridge, 1855); Westcott, after a diligent study of the Greek manuscripts of the canons, of their Latin versions, and especially of the Syriac manuscripts preserved in the British Museum, as also the systematic collections of the canons, made at different times, judges (contrary to Cosin), that "the external proof is decidedly against the authenticity of the catalogue forming the 2d part of the 59th canon of Laodicea." He thinks that "the catalogue is of oriental origin, and that some copyist borrowing the catalogue of Cyril of Jerusalem, has inserted it in the 59th canon after the first words of this decree." Prof. Spittler (according to Michaelis, p. 489) had already tried to show that this part of the canon of Laodicea is an imposture, and it is marked as suspected in many editions of the councils, for example, in Harduin (pp. 292, 293).

tolicity, although others afterward, especially in the East, from the days of Eusebius, and the evil days of Arianism, hesitated to accept and use it for public worship, although at the end of the fourth century many churches of the Greeks, as Jerome says,[1] did not receive it *with the same freedom* as their predecessors, and as all the Western churches still do,—yet their objections never had a historical character, and were always rejected or combated by the great body of the theologians. The church could never be named that had absolutely rejected it, and never was an attack made upon it, which was not itself censured; so that Augustine at the end of the fourth century, and beginning of the fifth, put the rejection of the Apocalypse among the heresies (De Hæres. cap. xxx.) as Tertullian had done in the second and third. (Contra Marcion, Lib. iv.)

Witnesses of the Fifth Century.

The fifth century at length saw an end of the uncertainties which had followed, in the fourth, the days of Eusebius and the controversy of the antimillenarians. In this time, when Arianism had produced so much evil in the churches, there were seen minds disposed to disregard the testimonies of antiquity, to give themselves up to rash conjectures about texts, with no historical basis, and supported by only dogmatic prejudices. It is to this tendency of his time that Jerome alludes, when, speaking of the epistle to the Hebrews and of the Apocalypse, he said (Ep. 119 ad Dardan.) "And yet for us, we receive both these books, thus conforming ourselves, not to the fashions of the day, but to the authority of the ancient authors." Starting, therefore, from the first half of this century, the churches at length often gave to the sacred book of the Apocalypse that unanimous reception which the other books had already long enjoyed.

[1] Nec Græcorum quidem ecclesiæ Apocalypsin Joannis eadem libertate suscipiunt, et tamen nos (eam) suscipimus . . . veterum scriptorum auctoritatem sequentes. (Epist. ad Dardanum, tom. ii. p. 608. Paris Edit.)

SECTION II.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

Its Character and History.

The matter, the style, the arrangement, and the movement of thought of this book, stamp it with a peculiar character of majesty. To the depth and loftiness of the doctrines correspond the noble eloquence of the discourse, the sublime calmness, authority, and simplicity of the language. We abstain here in general from drawing our arguments from internal criticism, and from seeking them anywhere else than in the testimonies of history; but the impression produced in every age by the religious sublimity of its instructions is itself a fact of history. God, who had often spoken by his prophets, at length speaks to us by his own Son, the brightness of his glory, the express image of his person, and as superior to the angels as the Creator is to the creature. We must then contemplate the eternal existence of this Son of God and his mysterious humanity; his apostleship, and his eternal priesthood, his unspeakable sympathy, his all-powerful intercession and the fullness of his expiation; then, also, the divine harmony of the two Testaments, the identical characters of the elect in all ages, the ardent aspirations of the ancient people of God in regard to Christ, the eternal safety of those who belong to him, the terrible ruin of those who reject him; in fine, the cloud of witnesses who attest to us the efficacy, the power, and the realities of faith. Such are the sublime topics of this epistle; and the whole ends with a final adoration rendered to that God of peace who hath brought again from the dead the great shepherd of the sheep through the blood of the everlasting covenant, and who alone is able to do for us that which is well pleasing by Jesus Christ, to whom be glory, for ever and ever!

Evidently written before the ruin of the temple,[1] and, from all appearance, before the martyrdom of James, which took place A. D. 62, and to which it seems to make allusion,[2] this epistle, addressed moreover directly to Hebrew converts, and sent consequently either to Palestine, or more particularly to the church of Jerusalem, or to the Hebrews scattered in all the empire, forms rather a treatise than a letter. It must have circulated first from Jerusalem in all the oriental Israelitish congregations; and we might reasonably expect, if this Scripture is authentic, that it would be especially the Israelitish churches of the East, the Syrian flocks, and particularly the church of Jerusalem, which would furnish us the most authentic and credible information. It will be readily granted, on the contrary, that, if this Scripture is forged, it was among the Hebrews rather than any portion of Christendom where the most violent opposition would be made to its legitimacy. It would be the most impossible of all things that an impostor should seek and find his partisans, his recommendations, and his false testimonies, among the churches of Judea.

Now this is precisely the historical fact (and a fact worthy of especial notice) that the epistle to the Hebrews was received as divine from the days of the apostles, and with no intermission, both at Jerusalem, among the Syrian Christians, and in all the churches of the East.

It must also be conceded that if, as it affirms, this letter was written in Italy, very shortly before the Neronian persecutions, it would then have been quickly known among the Christians in Rome. Now it is equally admitted, even among the adversaries, that it was fully acknowledged and quoted in Rome by Clement the Bishop of Rome, cotemporary with Paul, the most ancient and most respected of the apostolical Fathers.

At the same time the churches of the West, and more

[1] Heb. ix. 6, 7; x. 1, 2, 3, 11.

[2] Heb. xiii. 7; *τὴν ἔκβασιν τῆς ἀναστροφῆς.*

especially this very Church of Rome, after having first rendered to this epistle so decided testimony, began, toward the first half of the third century, to express doubts concerning it, on account of the use made of it by the Montanists and the Novatians.[1] We believe we should accordingly leave a special place for the Latin Fathers in the review we are about to make of the testimonies of antiquity; and we will commence by exhibiting the unanimity of the eastern churches on this subject. It will perhaps be best, in this review, to begin at the fourth century in the East, and go backward to the first, thence returning to the fourth or fifth in the West.

The Testimony of the East in the Fourth Century.

And first, to what man more worthy of belief could we appeal, in the fourth century, than to the very patriarch of the Hebrews, Cyril of Jerusalem, one of the most learned men of his day, and also one of the most pious? He was born A. D. 315. Already famous at the age of thirty-four years, he composed his "Catechisms," among the earliest expositions of the Christian faith now extant. He was also one of the most eminent leaders of the second œcumenical council, held in Constantinople, A. D. 381.[2] Now Cyril, when he gives us, at Jerusalem, in his fourth Catechism, "the Catalogue of the divine and inspired Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments," there reckons, besides the seven catholic epistles, the fourteen epistles of Paul: and he declares that "the collection of all these books is transmitted to us by the apostles and the ancient bishops, the presidents of the Church."

And again, what other oriental witness was better informed than the learned Jerome? When he had gone from Rome

[1] Without doubt because they perverted the 6th chapter in their favor. See Kirchhofer, Hist. of the Canon, pp. 240, 243, 247, 425, (Quellensammlung zur Gesch. des N. T. Can. bis auf Hieron.) Zurich, 1842.

[2] See Socrates, H. E. v. 8.

to Palestine to pursue his labors on the Scriptures, he had probably taken with him the Latin prejudices against the epistle to the Hebrews. And yet he attests that he receives it, as well as the Apocalypse; and he also declares to western Christians, in the letter to Dardanus already mentioned, that not only is it now received as of Paul in all the churches of the East, but that formerly it had been received *by all the ancient Greek writers*, and that it was daily read in the assemblies of the church. "See," said he, "what it is we should declare among our people (that is, the Latins), although the major part attribute it to Barnabas or Clement." "And it is a matter of little moment to us which of them wrote it, since it is daily sanctioned by being read in the churches." "Even if the usage of the Latins does not admit it among the canonical Scriptures, yet we admit it." "We must by no means in that follow the custom of these times (among the Romans); but rather the authority of the ancient authors."[1]

Thus it is supposed that it was especially the testimony of Jerome, as well as that of Augustine, which was the means employed by God to bring back the Roman Church from the grave error into which she had fallen for so long a period, in reference to this epistle, and to restore it among her members to its place in the canon.

It would still be difficult, in this very century among the Orientals, to present a witness more worthy of our confidence than Athanasius, by reason of his place in the universal church, as well as of his science and his discernment in Christian antiquities. Now, this Father, with all the eastern churches, received the epistle to the Hebrews. We have read in his "Catalogue of the Scriptures regarded as canonical and transmitted and believed as divine," these express words: "Of Paul the apostle, there are fourteen epistles" (Παύλου ἀποστόλου ἐπιστολαὶ δεκατέσσαρες). He enu-

[1] See also his 125th Epistle to Evagrius: "The Epistle to the Hebrews, which is received by all the Greeks and some of the Latins."

merates them, and he places in the tenth rank his epistle to the Hebrews, before his four pastoral letters.

We could also still quote in this century Titus of Bozra, A. D. 362, the Council of Laodicea, A. D. 367, Epiphanius, A. D. 368, Basil the Great, A. D. 370, Gregory Nazianzen, A. D. 370, Gregory of Nyssa and Ephraim the Syrian, A. D. 371, Diodorus of Tarsus, A. D. 378, Amphilochius of Iconium, A. D. 380, Theodore of Mopsuesta, A. D. 394, and Chrysostom, A. D. 398. We learn from Epiphanius (Hæres. 69) and from Theodoret,[1] that in their time, outside of the church, this epistle, on account of its splendid testimony to the divinity of Jesus Christ, was rejected by certain antitrinitarian heretics. This latter Father says, "We must not be surprised if these men, tainted with the Arian malady, were so crazy in regard to the apostolical Scriptures, as to wish to separate the epistle to the Hebrews from them, and to call it illegitimate (*νόθον*). For if they dared to lift their tongue against our God and Saviour, what would they not dare to do against the most devoted and the most sublime heralds of his truth?"

But we return to the third century.

Testimony of the East in the Third Century.

Without pausing at Dionysius of Alexandria[2] and the Council of Antioch, which alike received the epistle to the Hebrews as of Paul, we could not do better for this epoch than to consult first Eusebius, who was distinguished already in the close of the century, but who rather belonged to the next, and the great Origen, who begins the third century, and who, still more learned, consecrated his strength and his life to the study of the Scriptures.

In the twenty-fifth chapter of his third book, Eusebius does not hesitate to class in the canon of the uncontested

[1] Interpret. Ep. ad. Hebr. proem. Opp. iii. 541.
[2] Euseb. H. E. vi. 41.

books all the fourteen epistles of Paul, without excepting that to the Hebrews. "The fourteen epistles of Paul," he says again, in his third chapter, "are evident and sure (πρόδηλοι καὶ σαφεῖς); but it would not be just to overlook the rejection of the epistle to the Hebrews by some, who say that the Roman Church disputes its Pauline origin."

Origen, almost a century earlier, received it so fully as divine, that he composed homilies to expound it to the people. See likewise his words in a passage which Eusebius has preserved: "The style of the epistle to the Hebrews has not the character of simplicity so peculiarly belonging to this apostle, who calls himself a man plain of speech; but the letter is more Hellenic in its structure, as every one admits who can distinguish the difference of styles. But, on the other hand, that the thoughts of this epistle are admirable, and not inferior to the Scriptures universally received as apostolical, is what every one who reads the apostles attentively should acknowledge with us."[1] He adds, "See then what would be my opinion; it is that the thoughts are indeed the apostle's, but the phrase and construction belong to some author who remembered the apostolical instructions, or to some man who wrote notes on the instructions of a teacher. If, then, some church holds this epistle as of Paul, let it be praised for it (εὐδοκιμείτω καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ); for *it is not without reason* (οὐ γὰρ εἰκῇ) *that the men of antiquity have transmitted it as Paul's.* Who was, then, the author of this epistle? God knows; but the rumor has come to us (ἡ δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς φθάσασα ἱστορία) from some persons, that Clement, he who became bishop of the Romans, was its author; and from some others, that it was Luke, who wrote the Gospel and the Acts."

Such, then, was the state of minds in the East, in the third century, in regard to this holy epistle, if we may judge from Origen and Eusebius. All esteemed it to be divine, and almost all believed it to be from Paul. It was the opinion,

[1] H. E. vi. 25.

they tell us, *of all the men of antiquity.* They had transmitted it as a book of Paul; but some of Origen's contemporaries were induced, not at all by historical reasons, but simply because the style is so elegant, to believe that Paul could not have been its immediate author, and that he may rather have given the thought to some of his companions in labor, to Clement, for instance, or to Luke. And Origen gives this supposition, too, only as a "rumor" that had reached his ears, from "some persons," and not even as an opinion which he admitted.

Testimony of the East in the Second Century.

Having reached the second century, we may invoke one of the most weighty testimonies in the person of Clement of Alexandria, the most learned and influential man of his day, teaching with extraordinary success in the most learned city of the East. Born only forty years after the death of John, he himself said he was "a neighbor by his age to the apostolical times."[1] So that when he, with Origen, supports his testimony on that "*of the ancients*," these ancients can be no other than the cotemporaries of the apostles themselves. He carried, very imprudently without doubt, into the study of Christianity the pretensions and the habits of his philosophy; but this very disposition, which might injure the purity of his faith, perhaps so much the more guarantees the independence of his judgment concerning the epistle to the Hebrews. Here are his own words as Eusebius reports them:[2]

"The epistle to the Hebrews is the work of Paul. He himself wrote it in Hebrew, and Luke translated it into Greek.[3] Hence its resemblance in style to the Acts. And if Paul placed at the head of it neither his name nor his title of Apostle, it was for a sufficient reason. He was addressing persons greatly prejudiced against him; he therefore

[1] Strom. i. 1.

[2] H. E. Lib. vi. chap. 14.

[3] This supposition we shall presently refute.

prudently withheld his name, that they might not be prevented from reading it. Besides, and it is what the blessed elder[1] said (ὁ μακάριος πρεσβύτερος), considering that our Lord, as apostle or *envoy* from the Most High, was especially sent (ἀπεστάλη) to the people of the Hebrews, and that the epistle to the Hebrews alone in the New Testament calls him by that name (Heb. iii. 1), it was proper that Paul should abstain from giving himself that title of *Apostle to the Hebrews* in his letter, whether from modesty, from reverence to the Lord, or because he was simply *the Apostle to the Gentiles.*"

This testimony of Clement of Alexandria, with that of Origen, is not only of great weight with him who considers the character of these godly men, their learning, their travels, their proximity to the time and place in which the epistle was written; but it weighs still more when we think of their prejudices in regard to the style and the Hellenic elegance of the book. The historical evidence must have been irresistible for these two men who saw themselves compelled by the unanimous tradition of the Eastern churches to recognize that, after all, Paul was the author of the epistle.

Moreover, as has been said, the testimony of Clement being that of the church of Alexandria, founded by the very Mark[2] whom Peter (1 Pet. v. 13) calls "my son," and whom Paul (2 Tim. iv. 11; Col. iv. 10) sent for from his prison in Rome (because, he says, "he is profitable to me for the ministry"), this Mark who, it is said,[3] was present at the martyrdom of both these apostles; this evidence, we say, thus becomes the joint testimony of Mark, Peter, and Paul.

We might also have counted among the Eastern witnesses during this second century, and like us speaking in the name

1 Clement has been supposed to refer here to the pious Pantænus, the Apostle of India, who was still living at Alexandria A. D. 216, where he had established a school, and where Clement himself was one of his pupils.

2 Euseb. H. E. v. 10. Jerome, De Viris Illustr. xxxv.

3 Irenæus, Adv. Hæres. iii. 1.

of the churches of Alexandria, of Smyrna, and of Ephesus, — first Pantænus, the celebrated missionary of the oriental nations and the master of Clement of Alexandria; — then Ignatius and Polycarp, who, without expressly quoting the epistle, make very clear allusions to it; — in fine, Irenæus himself, who, before establishing himself in Gaul, A. D. 178, belonged by education to Asia. In fact, although this Father has not clearly quoted the epistle in his book on the Heresies,[1] he has still made mention of it, Eusebius says, and he quotes certain passages of it in a book of his now lost.[2] But we prefer to come to the very century of the apostles themselves.

Testimony of the East in the First Century.

In this first century, it is not in the East alone, but also in the West, that we find abundant proof of the admission already begun of this epistle into the canon of the Scriptures; alike in Rome and in Babylon. On the one hand, we see it translated in the first century into Syriac, in the Peshito, the most ancient of the versions; and, on the other, we may cite in its favor two irrefutable witnesses, both cotemporaries of Paul, and both martyrs. Thus it was not without strong reasons that Clement of Alexandria and Origen said that in their day the epistle had in its favor "*the ancients.*" But who were the ancients for them if not the cotemporaries or the immediate successors of the apostles? Now, these two testimonies which remain to us to quote are, that of Clement of Rome, who, in his letter to the Corinthians,[3] has made such frequent quotations from this epistle, as

[1] II. 55 (Heb. i. 3); iii. 6 (Heb. iii. 5); iv. 26 (Heb. x. 1); iv. 30, and v. 5 (Heb. xi. 5).

[2] H. E. Lib. iv. 26. It is in his book, "Of Divers Essays," (Διαλέξεων διαφόρων); ἐν ᾧ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολῆς . . . μνημονεύει, ῥητά τινα ἐξ (αὐτῆς) παραθέμενος.

[3] Eusebius, H. E. iii. 38. Clement *ad Cor.* ch. xxxvi. (Heb. 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 13–15; viii. 1–3); ch. xvii. (Heb. xi. 37); ch. xliii. (Heb. iii. 5); ch.

already seen in the extracts we have given from it. He evidently had it before him while writing his letter; he does not name the author, but he quotes entire passages from him, and paraphrases many others; and this fact, so prominent in his entire letter, was already noticed by Eusebius and Jerome. The other witness is Simon Peter himself.

The second epistle of Peter, written shortly before his death, was addressed by him, as apostle of the circumcision, to the converted Hebrews.[1] He there speaks to them (iii. 15) of another letter which Paul had addressed to them, "Even as our beloved brother Paul also according to the wisdom given unto him has written unto you; as also in all his epistles." Paul, then, had written to these converted Hebrews; there must then have existed somewhere a letter addressed by him to the Hebrews, and received as such by the churches of the circumcision; for it must be noticed that Peter is careful to distinguish the epistles of Paul as belonging to two classes; that which he had written to the Hebrews, and "his *other epistles*." This letter of Paul to the Hebrews could therefore be no other than that to which all the oriental churches had given this title, and which they placed in the rank of his thirteen other epistles.

Thus the numerous testimonies, unanimous and continuous, of all the East in favor of the epistle to the Hebrews go back in the church to the remotest antiquity. They may be followed uninterruptedly and uncontradicted even to the middle of the fifth century; and in that interval more than forty Greek Fathers may be found who received this epistle as from Paul. If two or three among them spoke of certain doubts, it was not in their own name. These doubts, originated by others, among the Latins, and of a late date, were repelled by all the orientals.

xxi. (Heb. iv. 12); ch. xxvii. (Heb. vi. 18); ch. xxiii. (Heb. x. 37); ch. ix. (Heb. xi. 5, 8, 31); ch. x. (Heb. xi. 8); ch. xii. (Heb. xi. 31); ch. xviii. (Heb. iii. 2; xi. 2, 4, 5, 37, 39); ch. lvi. (Heb. xii. 6).

[1] 2 Pet. i. 1. Compare 1 Pet. i. 1.

Western Testimonies.

It was quite otherwise among the Western churches, but only after the middle of the third century. At first, instructed in regard to the epistle to the Hebrews, during the whole course of the first century, of the second, and the first years of the third, they were not after that as constant in their testimony as the Eastern churches; and they even went so far as to be almost all misled by the influence of Rome, and that for a very long period.

We have seen that at the close of the first century the church of Rome furnished us, in the person of Clement, its bishop, an irrefutable witness of the faith then professed. He was also the witness for the other Western churches during the entire course of the second century; for we have seen that Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, quoted him in one of his writings.[1] And if afterwards this very author, in his book "Against the Heresies," avoided making any express use of it, it was, as is supposed, because occupying an eminent place in the West, he thought he ought not to furnish the Montanists arguments by quoting a book which they used to sustain their errors. So too in Africa, Tertullian, who was a Montanist, had at first very explicitly quoted the epistle to the Hebrews in the 20th chapter of his book "De Pudicitia," composed, according to Cave, about the end of the second century. He there quoted the epistle to the Hebrews, and quite at length, the celebrated passage in which the author declares that men falling after having received certain illuminations can never be renewed to repentance. He there attributes the epistle to Barnabas, "that man," he says, "whom Paul had associated with himself; that companion of the apostles, taught by them and teaching with them." To these monuments of the respect which the Latin church still professed for this epistle during the first two

[1] We have said, it is the *βιβλίον τι διαλέξεων διαφόρων*. Euseb. H. E. v. 26.

centuries and the first half of the third, we may add a new, important testimony. It is that which has just been furnished us by the appearance of the long-lost book of Hippolytus the martyr "On the Heresies."[1] This Father, it is known, although coming from the East, resided a long time in Italy in the diocese of Rome. Now, the Oxford presses have recently (1851) published this book from the original, which had just been discovered. Just as in 1628, the unexpected discovery of the epistle of Clemens Romanus changed the judgments of Sacred Criticism concerning the authority of the epistle to the Hebrews in the Western churches during the first century, so now, in our day, the appearing of the book of Hippolytus, which quotes the epistle to the Hebrews as having an apostolical authority,[2] extends our ideas of the assent given to this Scripture among the Western churches on to the middle of the third century. Hippolytus is supposed to have died about A. D. 240.

It was at Rome, about the beginning of the third century, that the same priest Caius, who is supposed to have originated the doubts about the Apocalypse, in a writing against the Montanists, also expressed the first doubts concerning the epistle to the Hebrews. From this epoch, the credit of this Scripture appears to have so declined among the Latins that Tertullian, who, before the attacks of Caius, had boldly quoted it, afterward referred to it only with a certain reserve, in condescension to the Latin church. This is a remark of Hug. The canon of Muratori, whose date is uncertain and which many attribute to Caius, but which certainly is after Marcion, does not contain the epistle to the Hebrews. And after Tertullian, Cyprian, in the same place, did not receive it; he names seven churches to which Paul had written, and does not speak of the epistle to the Hebrews.[3] From that

[1] Κατὰ πασῶν αἱρεσέων ἔλεγχος.

[2] See Bunsen in his *Hippolytus*, or Critical Researches into the doctrine and practice of Rome under Commodus and Alex. Severus; 4 vols. Lond. 1852, (vol. i. p. 127.)

[3] Cyprian. Testim. ad Judæos, i. 20. De Exhortatione Martyr, cap. ii.

time the Latins everywhere took the same view, to about the end of the next century.

The cause of this aberration of the Western churches, we have said, is not unknown. The controversy with the Montanists first suggested it to Caius; and when the Novatians renewed, fifty years afterward, the doctrine and the disciplinary rigors of the Montanists, sustaining themselves by this book, as Jerome, Augustine, and Epiphanius inform us, the Latins then, desirous of combating them more advantageously, were induced to reject it. And we have already heard Philastrius expressly declare that the liturgical use of the epistle ceased in some churches, because of what it says of penitence (vi. 4, etc.) and on account of the Novatians;[1] but he places these notions and usages among the heresies of certain persons. (Hæresis quorumdam de epistolâ Pauli ad Hebræos).

At the same time, we must understand, this late and temporary opposition of the Latins, so far from weakening our faith in the canonicity of this book, rather serves to confirm it; because it shows us that all its detractors were never able to produce one historical fact to sustain their objections, not one contradictory tradition, not one argument of any value. If a book of Cicero were presented to us which the writers of his age had unanimously attributed to him, and which all those of the succeeding century had not ceased to place in the collection of his works, we should not find it difficult to ascribe it to him although we found persons, far from Rome and three centuries afterward, without giving good reasons and without contesting the testimony of antiquity, had simply raised objections to the book which any one in our times is just as capable of raising. Testimony to historical facts may increase in force as it approaches the time of the events; but matters of mere argument men of every age may be equally competent to weigh.

1 De Hæresibus, 40. Bibl. Patrum Max. v. p. 711. De pœnitentia autem propter Novatianos.

However it may have been with this opposition of the Latins during the latter half of the third century and the first half of the fourth, our epistle, which had never ceased to be received by all the Greeks, began again, from the middle of this fourth century, to be acknowledged by the Latins. In A. D. 354, Hilary of Poitiers regarded it as of Paul; he was imitated by Ambrose, bishop of Milan; by Philastrius, bishop of Brescia, and many others; so that at length Jerome and Augustine, more learned than their cotemporaries, enlightened them on this question, appealing to historical proofs, to the testimony of the Orientals, and to the authority of all Christian antiquity. It was probably their influence that caused it to be received by the council of Carthage, in A. D. 397, as written by Paul. From the fifth century, all the churches have unanimously received it, to our day.

Review of these Testimonies.

We conclude, then, from all these facts:

1. That the canonicity of the epistle, immediately after its publication, was recognized in the West as in the East, at Rome as at Jerusalem.

2. That the same testimony was rendered to it afterward without interruption in all the East, both among Syrian and Greek Christians.

3. That this recognition continued among the Western churches through the second century and first half of the third.

4. That if the Latin churches, and more especially that of Rome, hesitated in regard to it, or even refused to receive it during the last half of the third century and first half of the fourth, they at last ranked themselves unanimously on the side of the primitive testimony of the universal Church, as of the constant and invariable testimony of the Eastern churches.

5. That the Church of Rome has varied and grievously

erred on this important point; and that if, for 1500 years, she has stood firm in the faith of this truth with the East, she has maintained on this subject (to use the expression of Tertullian, Augustine, and Philastrius, against those who rejected some of the books of the second-first canon[1]) a *heresy of two centuries.*

6. That while this long aberration, before the epoch of the definite settlement of the canon, has not any importance in the question of its providential preservation, because the churches could[2] not have an entire unanimity on the whole canon before this epoch, yet the fact has a crushing weight for the pretensions of a church which calls itself the Judge of controversies and of the truth.

7. That this same church, then, still errs, if not more gravely at least more unreasonably, in pretending, despite such manifest facts, to be for all others the infallible depositary of the Scriptures, and in repeating, after Gregory VII.[3] that "no chapter of any book of the Bible should be regarded as canonical without the permission of the Sovereign Pontiff."

8. That what Christianity owes to the Roman Church in this matter, is, twice to have made war on the canon; twice to have broken the unity of the Church on this point; — first in rejecting for two centuries an epistle which she herself had recognized for two centuries before, and which she has again recognized from the end of the fourth century and beginning of the fifth; then, in persisting alone, ten centuries afterward, to introduce apocryphal books into the New Testament canon, against the earnest remonstrances of all the rest of Christendom, which, while having them publicly read, had always rejected them from the canon during fifteen hundred years, both in the East and in the West.

[1] The two first apply it to the rejection of the Apocalypse, the third to that of the epistle to the Hebrews.

[2] The author uses the word *devaient*. It may mean *should, ought to, were to.* — Tr.

[3] See the Annals of Baronius, Year 1076.

9. That the infallibility assumed by Rome as a heritage of the apostle Peter should always be judged by the single fact that she has not preserved a Scripture which this same Peter had expressly recommended to her as making part of the sacred oracles, and which had been recommended to her also, shortly afterward, by that Clement whom she had made the second, third, or fourth of her bishops.[1]

10. That so far from giving authority to our canon of the New Testament, the Roman Church on the contrary received hers from the Greek Church (at least so far as concerns the epistle to the Hebrews); and that we owe her no thanks that this holy book has not been lost from our Bible.

11. In fine, that the authority of the canon, as to the New Testament, is not founded either on Rome, which has variously and grievously erred, by her own admission, in regard to it, nor on any provincial council, nor on any particular church, nor upon any general council, but solely on the unanimous consent — unforeseen, unintended, and providential — of the whole of Christendom on this subject alone. For notwithstanding the enormous divergencies on every other subject, we see to-day, over the whole world, all the churches, good and bad, maintained of God in unity on this solitary point; as we see on the other hand, for the Old Testament, all the ancient people of Israel and all modern Jews equally abiding in the unity of faith concerning the Old Testament, because the oracles of God are committed to them for the Old, as to us for the New. But we can here barely suggest this point, it not coming yet fully before us

Paulinity of this Epistle.[2]

The Paulinity of this epistle should be carefully distinguished from its *canonicity*, when we are studying the his-

[1] Jerome says the 2d; Augustine says the 3d; Irenæus says the 4th. See Hefele, Patr. Apostolic. Opera, p. 21. Tubing. 1847.

[2] On these matters may be consulted the first volume of Moses Stuart;

tory of the canon. The apostolicity of a book, in fact, would not by itself be a reason for canonicity; because all the writings, discourses, or acts of an apostle or a prophet would be neither necessarily nor constantly inspired. The theopneusty or inspiration was a miraculous endowment (χάρισμα), and the miraculous gifts were intermittent, according as the Spirit descended upon the men of God. A Scripture was then infallible and divine when the Spirit of God caused it to be written; it was so only then; and the Spirit of God caused it to be written when it pleased him, whether the writer was an apostle, as Paul or Peter, or only a prophet, as Luke or Mark.

Many Fathers of the first centuries accordingly believed this epistle to be inspired, without ascribing it to Paul; and we might mention many modern writers, otherwise worthy of respect, who have also believed this distinction should be made as to the epistle to the Hebrews. Their mistake lay, we think, in the fact, not in the principle. This was the opinion, for instance, of our two leading reformers, Luther and Calvin, at a time when the subject had been less studied, and especially when the letter of Clement had not been found, which, written in Rome and in the century of the apostles, renders so manifest a testimony to this holy Scripture.[1] Luther ascribed it to Apollos, without sustaining this gratuitous conjecture on any historical argument. Calvin himself, without attempting to frame a hypothesis, wrote in the preface to his Commentary, "I see not how to recognize Paul as its author." (Ego, ut Paulum agnoscam autorem, adduci nequeo.) "Yet as to myself I receive it unhesitatingly among the apostolical epistles; and I do not doubt that it is only by device of Satan that there are found per-

the Theses of Prof. La Harpe (Toulouse, 1832); the Introduction of Hug, that of Guericke (1854), and Fr. Spanheim, De Auctore Epis. ad Hebr. Exerc. Heidelberg (1659). He sustains the Paulinity.

[1] It was only in 1628 that Cyril Lucas sent from Constantinople to the king of England the ancient Alexandrian Manuscript of the Scriptures, in which they had the joy of finding the epistle of Clement.

sons disposed to remove it from the number of the authentic books." Beza, too, said, in the first note of his Commentary: "Let the judgments of men remain free here; only let us here agree that this epistle was truly dictated by the Holy Spirit."

Many of the Fathers the most firmly attached to the canonicity of the epistle, such as Dionysius and Clement of Alexandria, Euthalius, Theodoret, Theophylact, and Jerome, have at the same time supposed, on account of its elegance, that it must have been composed in Hebrew by Paul, but translated into Greek by Luke or Barnabas. This was only a conjecture; it did not affect the canonicity directly. But we repel it, because, —

1. None of those who talk of this Hebrew original have ever mentioned the person who had seen it.

2. The superior elegance of this epistle can be accounted for, and we shall presently do it.

3. It would be a historical error to imagine, in the days of Paul, the Hebrew better adapted than the Greek to the religious wants of the entire Jewish people. The Greek was then universally understood even in Jerusalem; it had been spoken in that city for about four hundred years;[1] and the Jews "of the Dispersion," who used it in all the East, often knew nothing of the Hebrew. Thus we see that the greater part of the Jewish Christians of Jerusalem had separate synagogues for the exercises of worship in the Greek language.

4. Nothing in the epistle denotes a translation; everything, on the contrary, bears the impress of originality.

5. The paranomasias, that is, the allusions founded on the resemblance in sense and sound, abound in it, betraying inevitably an original writing.[2] In particular, says Calvin,

[1] The city submitted to Alexander the Great about B. C. 332, and the epistle was written A. D. 64.

[2] See in Greek, Heb. ii. 7, 8 (Comp. with Ps. viii); v. 8, 14; vii. 13, 19; ix. 10; x. 34; xi. 37; xiii. 14.

"that which is said of the nature of the 'testament,' in the ninth chapter, could have sprung from no other fountain than the Greek word."

6. The author's commentaries on the passages quoted from the Old Testament conduct to the same conclusion, for they attest that the quotations were taken, not from the original Hebrew, but from the Greek Septuagint version.[1]

If many Fathers and scholars, in admitting the inspiration of this Scripture, would find for it some other author than Paul, we on the contrary can establish his authorship by strong arguments:

1. Against this testimony of history nothing has been set but presumptions and conjectures.

2. The expressions of this epistle concerning Timothy can belong, it would seem, only to Paul. He writes (xiii. 23), "Know ye that our brother Timothy is set at liberty; with whom, if he comes shortly, I will see you." Now, Paul had already connected Timothy with himself in seven others of his letters,[2] besides writing him two. He had made him his companion in the journey to Jerusalem (Acts xx. 4); he often elsewhere as here calls him "his brother and companion in labor."[3] He denominates him "My son," (1 Tim. i. 2); whilst no other personage of the New Testament, presents to our view, even remotely, this feature of intimacy with Timothy.

3. The author of the epistle speaks of "his bonds" (x. 34); and Paul was in bonds when the letter was written.

4. The author says to the Hebrews, "with whom, if he comes shortly, I will see you;" and Paul was soon to be released.

[1] See x. 4, 5, compared with Ps. xl. 7; viii. 8; ix. 14, 22, compared with Jerem. xxxi. 31, 32, and others, quoted in Owen's learned Commentary (5th exerc.)

[2] 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1; Rom. xvi. 21; 2 Thess. i. 1; Philip. i. 1; Col. i. 1.

[3] 2 Cor. i. 1; Philem. i. 1; Col. i. 1.

5. The author salutes them in the name of "the brethren of Italy" (xiii. 24); and Paul was then in Italy.

6. The letter was written necessarily during Nero's reign and Paul's life; that is, before A. D. 65 or 68. In fact, —

It represents the temple of Jerusalem as standing, and its worship as still celebrated;

The last war of the Romans against the Jews as about to commence. He says (x. 25), "Ye see the day approaching." But that terrible day had not yet come;

Timothy as still living, and disposed to leave Italy that he might visit the Hebrews with the author of the letter.

The letter is quoted by Clement, the "fellow laborer of Paul" (Philip. iv. 3), in the epistle written by that Father to the Corinthians in behalf of the church of Rome. See the reasoning of Eusebius himself on this fact: "Clement in his letter to the Corinthians, introduces many thoughts from the epistle to the Hebrews, and employs the very expressions of this epistle in the sentences which he copies from it; indicating evidently by that that it was not a new book to him."[1]

In fine, the letter is quoted even by the apostle Peter, who is said to have suffered martyrdom the same year with Paul; for we have seen that in his second epistle, written to the same persons with the first (2 Pet. iii. 1), he reminds them that Paul had written them a letter; "Even as our beloved brother Paul, according to the wisdom given unto him, hath written unto you."

7. All the weight of the historical evidence is in favor of the Paulinity of this letter. It is certain that, addressed especially to the church of Jerusalem, the mother of all the others, and for thirty-six years the center of Jewish Christendom, this epistle was read, from the beginning, as from Paul, in all the assemblies of the East. We have already seen the testimonies of the East as to its canonicity during

[1] H. E. iii. 38. Σαφέστατα παρίστησιν ὅτι μὴ νεὸν ὑπάρχει τὸ σύγγραμμα.

four centuries. Now, these very Fathers, while speaking sometimes of the doubts about it which were felt among the Latins, not only believed Paul to be its author, but said that they got that belief "from the ancient bishops" who had preceded them. Cyril of Jerusalem, in the fourth century, declares that such is the tradition "from the apostles and ancient rulers of the churches." Jerome attests with him that this epistle was received by all the Greek ecclesiastical writers downward *as of Paul* (ab omnibus retrô ecclesiasticis græci sermonis scriptoribus *quasi Pauli* Apostoli suscipi.) Athanasius, the council of Laodicea, Basil, Epiphanius, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa, Ephraim the Syrian, Chrysostom, and many others render the same testimony. Eusebius ascribes it to Paul, saying that the Roman church contests the fact, and supposing that Clement of Rome might have been its translator. Theodoret quotes Eusebius as having said that all the ancients believed that Paul was its author; he says that the Arians had begun to call it in question on account of the testimony it renders to the divinity of Jesus Christ; but he adds that "it was read in the churches of the apostolical times."[1] Origen,[2] believing it to be Paul's, at the same time quotes, as accounting for its great elegance, some suppositions, "the noise of which had come to him,"[3] as to the part such and such an apostolical man had had in translating it; but even he takes care to suggest that "it is not lightly (εἰκῇ) that the ancients have transmitted it as Paul's to the men of his day." And then Clemens Alexandrinus, in the second century, expressly declares that it is the work of Paul (Παύλου μὲν εἶναί φησι), while thinking that "perhaps, written in Hebrew by the apostle, it may have been translated by Luke into elegant Greek."

[1] Arg. in Epist. ad Hebræos, opp. (tom. iii. p. 341, Halle, 1768–1774.)

[2] Origen, who quotes the epistle to the Hebrews more than two hundred times (Kirchhofer, Quellensammlung, &c., Zurich, 1848, p. 244), very frequently repeats that it is Paul's.

[3] φθάσασα ἱστορία.

8. Very numerous points of resemblance between this epistle and the other compositions of Paul equally exhibit him as the author. Many skillful critics have fully set these forth. They may be found in Spanheim, Braun, Carpsovius, Lardner, MacKnight, La Harpe, Stuart, Tholuck; and M. Reuss[1] himself, who does not attribute this epistle to Paul, has had the candor to express himself thus on these analogies: "The resemblances which our epistle presents to the Pauline formula are so numerous and so striking, that it is not surprising so many have attributed it to Paul. They consist in a series of terms equally familiar to both authors, as well as in the very substance of the dogmatic ideas."

We shall indicate only a few of these resemblances: —

Explosions of feeling, expressed in very concise language peculiar to Paul;

Elliptical expressions to be filled out from the context;

Abrupt transitions to subordinate topics, to return as abruptly to the original topic;[2]

Replies addressed to the thoughts of the reader and made to objections unexpressed;

A hortatory and moral conclusion of the epistle, from the eleventh chapter, like the conclusions of other letters of Paul;

Exhortations entirely like those of Paul;

Judaic interpretations of Scripture found only in Paul;

Doctrines mentioned by no other inspired writers; the mediation and intercession of the Saviour;[3] the title of *Mediator*, given by Paul only to Jesus Christ;[4] Christ offering his sacrifice in heaven, and exercising his priesthood only there;

Frequent resemblances of style and expression between this epistle and the thirteen others of Paul: for instance, the

[1] Hist. of Christian Theology in the Apostolic Age, tom. ii. p. 550.
[2] See i. 2–4; iii. 7, 11, 14; iv. 2.
[3] Heb. iv. 15, 16; vii. 22, 25; Rom. viii. 34; Gal. iii. 19, 20.
[4] Heb. vii. 22; viii. 6; ix. 15; xii. 24; 1 Tim. ii. 5.

frequent use of the particle τέ; the passage in Heb. xiii. 5, compared with Rom. xii. 9, where we find two nominatives absolute, and more than one feminine nominative absolute followed by a masculine participle, nominative absolute (ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος, ἀποστυγοῦντες . . .) a construction found nowhere else in the New Testament. Also, the following passages;

Heb. ii. 4 compared with Rom. xv. 19; 2 Cor. xii. 12, with 2 Thess. ii. 9; — Heb. iii. 1, with Philip. iii. 14; — Heb. v. 12, with 1 Cor. iii. 2; — Heb. viii. 1, with Eph. i. 21; — Heb. ix., and x. 1, with Col. ii. 17; — Heb. x. 33, with 1 Cor. iv. 9; — Heb. xiii. 9, with Eph. iv. 14; — Heb. xiii. 10, 11, with 1 Cor. ix. 13; — Heb. xiii. 20, 21, with Rom. xv. 33; xvi. 20; Phil. iv. 9; 1 Thess. v. 23; 2 Cor. xiii. 11.

But what do the opponents set against all these arguments from criticism and history? No historical testimony; only presumptions and hypotheses. We must reply to them.

Objections.

It is first objected, that the apostle to the Gentiles, Paul, was not the apostle to the Jews and should not have written to them. But does he not style himself "the apostle *of all* to gain some"? (1 Cor. ix. 19, 22.) Did he not commence his ministry in each city, among the Hebrews? Was he not "a Hebrew of the Hebrews"? (Philip. iii. 5.) Did he not say, "My heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved"? (Rom. x. 1.) Had he not continual sorrow in his heart for his kinsmen according to the flesh? (Rom. ix. 2.) Had he not recently gone up to the capital of the Hebrews, to carry thither alms to his nation? (Acts xxiv. 17; Rom. xv. 25.) Could he then, we should say on the contrary, do otherwise than write to them?

Paul, it is said again, has not mentioned himself in this epistle, whilst at the head of each of his thirteen epistles he has placed his name and title of apostle. We reply; that, —

1. He had manifest prudential reasons, if not to conceal his name entirely, at least to avoid making it prominent, already mentioned by us.

2. This book being rather a treatise[1] than a letter, the author had not the same reasons for putting his name to it.

3. The book, whoever was its author, was written by a man who judged it best not to put his name there. "And if," as Primasius, an African bishop of the sixth century, observes, "it was for that reason not Paul's, for the same reason it was not Clement's, nor Barnabas's, nor Luke's, nor any one's, since no one has put his name there."[2]

4. Those Christian Hebrews to whom the letter was first addressed certainly knew what hand had written it. Could we doubt it after reading these words: "Pray for us, that I may be restored to you. — Know ye that our brother Timothy is set at liberty, with whom I will see you. — Salute all them that have the rule over you. — They of Italy salute you"? (Heb. xiii. 18, 19, 23, 24.)

5. It is sufficiently evident that the epistle would not have been read, from the first century, in Jerusalem and the Eastern assemblies, if the leaders of all these churches had not known its author.

6. It was proper that it should be circulated among the Hebrew believers, among the Judaizing Christians, and among the unconverted Hebrews; but it would have been imprudent to place at the head of it a name which would have made them reject it without examination.

7. We may remark with Mr. Wordsworth,[3] that if the name of Paul was not placed at the beginning, yet his word and his signature were at the end; for the apostolical salutation which he was accustomed to employ was, as he himself

[1] It has the form and structure of a treatise. It is short for an essay and long for a letter, 303 verses; and the author in closing apologizes for its brevity.

[2] Ad Hebræos Præfatio. Lugduni, 1537, p. 473.

[3] On the Canon, p. 234. Lond. 1847.

has called it, his distinctive mark in all these letters. "The salutation of Paul with mine own hand, which is the token in every epistle; The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you."[1] By this he means to say, This formula, "the grace of Christ be with you," or its equivalent, is the formula of salutation which I place at the end of all my letters." We know that they were all dictated to an amanuensis, except the epistle to the Galatians. He was satisfied with simply putting this mark or signature to them. It was a token, he himself said, by which his epistles should be known. Now, it should be observed that whilst this formula is found in the thirteen other epistles of Paul, it is not found in any of the letters of any other apostle written during his life, and is found only in writings after his death, — in the last verse of the Apocalypse, in the letter of Clemens Romanus to the Corinthians, and in the sermons of the Fathers, who were eager to adopt it from him. But this mark, invariably and exclusively attached to all his letters, is also found in Hebrews (xiii. 24, 25).

In the third place, it is objected that Paul said he had not learned the gospel of any man (Gal. i. 1, 11, 12; ii. 6–15), and showed himself very jealous of the independence of his ministry. Could he then have said, of the salvation which he announced, what we find in Heb. ii. 3: "So great salvation which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed *unto us* by them that heard him"? We reply, that Paul was in the habit of employing the first person plural when he meant to include only his readers; so that nothing can be determined by that passage, on this point. Thus, for instance, in the preceding verse he had said, "How shall *we* escape, if *we* neglect so great salvation?" Paul, in speaking of this danger, was thinking not of himself, but of his readers. And it is again thus that he says, in Romans xiii. 12: "Let us cast off the works of darkness." He had no works of darkness to cast off; and he did not

[1] 2 Thess. iii. 17; 1 Cor. xvi. 21; Col. iv. 18.

mean to include himself in this *us*, which he employed there as a common pronoun. As to Paul, moreover, it would also be true that the salvation announced by Jesus had been confirmed to him by them that heard him.

But that which is most insisted on as an objection to the Paulinity of this epistle is the classical purity of its language, the too Hellenic perfection of the composition.

To this we reply, that it was wholly natural that the apostle, on the solemn occasion of addressing a treatise to the whole Hebrew people, should bestow more pains on it than on an epistle to a more limited class of readers. He wished to show his nation, in an attractive picture, the holy and majestic unity of the revelations of God in the two economies, the innumerable correspondences of the Old Testament with the New; the beneficent light, full of glory, which the latter manifestations of the Son of God had just shed over Moses, the Psalms, and the Prophets. He would unfold to the Hebrews the importance and the sublime meaning of their own worship when interpreted by the gospel, the divinity of the Messiah proclaimed in their Scriptures, his holy and humiliated humanity equally predicted, his apostleship, his royal priesthood, his expiatory blood and his passage into heaven; in a word, the true Temple, the true Priest, the true Tabernacle, the true Victim, the true Passover, the true Holy of holies, as also the true faith of the true worshipers, and their true sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving.

2. There is no writer who has not had, among his writings, some one in which he desired to surpass himself by the purity of his language and the elevation of his style. Thus Cyprian, in his letter to Donatus; thus Tertullian, in his Apology; thus Calvin, in his Essay on Clemency, or in his Letter to Francis I.; as elsewhere Paul himself, in his letter to Philemon.

3. Is it not known that the apostle, independently of his inspiration, was, by both his genius and his education, a perfect master of style? Was he not born, and had he not

studied Greek literature, in the Grecian colony of Tarsus, a city renowned for its culture? Do we not frequently hear him quote the Greek poets? (Acts xvii. 28; 1 Cor. xv. 33; Tit. i. 12,) and does he not show in other parts of his writings what he was able to do? If he was, as he says, "rude in speech" (ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ), it was in his accent and not in his style or thought. And if he did judge it wise to write the Gentiles unpolished letters, he might judge it equally wise to address one to all his people in a more elegant and elaborate composition.

We must, then, conclude from all these testimonies and all these facts that Eusebius, in the beginning of the fourth century, very legitimately ranked this epistle in the first canon, because it had been received for two centuries by all Christendom, East and West, from its first appearing, and because it never afterward ceased to be received in all the Eastern churches. At the same time, in placing it with this Father, in our historical appreciation, in the rank of the homologomens and of the first canon, we have believed it should be assigned, with the Apocalypse, a place apart, on account of the late opposition which was made to it for a time by the Latin Church, after a century and a half of acquiescence. Besides, that church, submissive to this sacred book during the first and the second century, then disavowing it during the third and fourth, has ended by placing herself also in this matter, for fourteen hundred years, with the universal Church.

But we must now pass to the second canon, or *antilegomens*, which contain but 222 verses (a thirty-sixth part of the New Testament); and we shall equally establish their authenticity by history, before considering them under another point of view.

CHAPTER FOURTH.

OF THE SECOND CANON,

OR

THE FIVE ANTILEGOMENS.

SECTION I.

GENERAL FACTS.

If the twenty Scriptures of the first canon, as soon as they appeared, were received as divine by all the churches of Christendom, and if the two books of which the second-first is composed were at first universally admitted, it was not so with the five later brief epistles of James, Peter, John, and Jude. Accepted, Eusebius says, "by *the majority*," they were not by all, because, sent to the Christian people near the time when their authors were about to die, and moreover directed generally to the whole Church, they had not the same advantages for securing a universal reception as the greater part of the other apostolical writings. They lacked for that purpose both the personal influence and presence of the sacred authors, and the immediate testimony of the men or churches to whom all the non-catholic epistles were written at first. Consequently, we see that they must have been more slowly admitted by the remoter churches. Whilst a majority received these five epistles, from the very beginning, as making part of the Holy Scripture, there were many others, for two centuries and a half, who remained in suspense concerning the divine authority of one or another of

them; and it was not until the beginning of the fourth century, about A. D. 325, that we see these hesitations ceasing in all parts of the East and the West. Thus their universal and absolute adoption into the sacred canon was naturally delayed; but this very delay, while attesting at once the liberty and the holy jealousy of the primitive churches in regard to the canon, should only serve, as we shall presently show, to render our confidence in the amicable and final result more complete.

Origen, as Eusebius relates (H. E. vi. 25), said, of the last two epistles of John, that "it is not all Christians that receive them as authentic" (*οὐ πάντες φασὶ γνησίους εἶναι ταύτας*); and of the second of Peter, "they hold it in doubt" (*ἀμφιβάλλεται*).

Eusebius, too (H. E. iii. 25), at the beginning of the fourth century, said, "The epistles of James and Jude, and Peter's second, and the last two of John, are contested" (*ἀντιλεγόμεναι*); "while at the same time they are received by the great majority." He said too, "Although contested, yet they are recognized by the greater part of ecclesiastical men."

And as to the two epistles of James and Jude, he had said, "It is well known that these also are publicly read with the rest of the Scriptures." We have already showed that all the eleven catalogues which remain from the fourth century contain also the seven catholic epistles; that of Athanasius; that of the anonymous cotemporary of Athanasius, inscribed among his works; that of Epiphanius; those of Jerome, Rufinus, Augustine, the councils of Laodicea and Carthage; those of Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory Nazianzen, Amphilochius, and Philaster.

If from the earliest times the seven epistles have been called *catholic*, it is because they were addressed to the whole body of Christians, rather than to any particular church or person. It is also, perhaps, because this name, reserved first for the first epistles of John and Peter, as books catholicly accepted, might afterwards have been extended to the five

later epistles, when their divine authority had been generally admitted. But whatever may have been the meaning or the occasion of this term, its employment to designate the seven epistles not of Paul is certainly of a high antiquity. Not only do we meet it in Athanasius, Epiphanius, and Jerome, in the fourth century, but in Eusebius at the end of the third, or rather beginning of the fourth, in Dionysius of Alexandria before Eusebius, in the middle of the third, and in Origen before Dionysius.

The order in which, from the earliest times, the various books of the New Testament were respectively arranged, we have frequently said, was constantly that of our modern Bibles, except that the group of the seven catholic[1] epistles preceded the fourteen epistles of Paul. But then, too, both sets in each category were, relatively to each other, in the same order as in our Bible. As to the seven catholic epistles, the oldest collections of the Greeks, as well as our modern Bibles, have always placed them thus: first that of James, then the two of Peter, then the three of John, and then that of Jude. This is declared to be the genuine order by Jerome, who informs us also that in his day the Latins, by an indiscreet zeal for Peter, ranked his epistles before that of James; "but by God's help," he says,[2] "I have reëstablished them in the order wisely followed by the Greeks." This order related to their importance and size. Paul, in his epistle to the Galatians (ii. 9), speaks of James, Cephas, and John, who are regarded as pillars; and it is also in the same order (James, Peter, and John) that their epistles have been ranked.

1 Already so called in the time of Eusebius, Cyril, and Athanasius (H. E. vi. 14). Athan. Epist. Festal. Conc. de Laod. 59. Cyril, Catech. iv.

2 *Prol. in Epist. Canon.* Non idem ordo apud Græcos qui integrè sapiunt et fidem rectam sectantur, epistolarum septem quæ canonicæ nuncupantur, qui in Latinis codicibus invenitur. Quod quia Petrus primus est in numero apostolorum, primæ sint etiam ejus epistolæ in ordine cæterarum. Sed has proprio ordini, Deo nos juvante, reddidimus. Est enim prima earum una, Jacobi, Petri duæ, Johannis tres, et Judæ una.

It will be proper in this review, in which we propose to establish their authenticity, to commence with James.

SECTION II.

THE EPISTLE OF JAMES.

Its Importance.

This letter, judging only from its author, is the first of the catholic epistles, and James commences it with these words: "James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad, greeting."

It must have been clothed, among the primitive churches, and especially among the Christians of Jewish origin, with a special importance, from the eminent place occupied by its author among all the apostles, among all the bishops, among all the eye-witnesses of Christ's resurrection, among all the martyrs.

We say, among all the *apostles*. Not only was James one of the Lord's brothers, with Joses, Jude, and Simon (Gal. i. 19; Mark vi. 3), that is to say, either half-brother or cousin-german, being, according to some, the son of his mother by Alpheus, or, according to others, his cousin-german, the son of that Mary, sister of his mother, who remained so faithfully before the cross and the sepulchre (Matt. xxii. 56; xxviii. 1); but, moreover, he was so considerable among all the apostles (Gal. i. 19) that Peter, when he dissimulated at Antioch, "feared certain that came from James," (Gal. ii. 12) and that in leaving the prison in Jerusalem, he hastened to say, distinguishing him from all the others, "Go, show these things to James, and to the brethren" (Acts xii. 17). Paul himself named him the first of the three pillars of the primitive church (Gal. ii. 9).

Eminent, we have said, among all the *bishops*. He presided for twenty-seven years over that church of Jerusalem

which was the center and hearth-stone, the model and the mother of all the others; he there, by his great influence, secured the decision of the first council; he was then the object of the attentions of Paul, Peter, and the apostles who, twenty years after our Lord had ascended, still assembled with all the elders in his house (Acts xv. 13; xxi. 13). For more than a quarter of a century he there enjoyed, as Josephus informs us, the respect of the Jews, who surnamed him the *Just*, and who were indignant at his cruel death,[1] regarding it as one cause of their final destruction.

Eminent, too, among the *eye-witnesses of the resurrection of Jesus*, James was honored (1 Cor. xv. 7) by a special apparition of the Lord, as Mary his mother had been on the way to the sepulcher, and Cleopas[2] his father on the way to Emmaus.

Eminent, too, among all the *martyrs*, James was the first among the authors of the New Testament, and the second of the apostles, to lay down his life for Christ. His colleague James the Great, the brother of John, had been decapitated by the order of Herod Agrippa, only ten years after the ascension of the Lord; but our James, "the Lord's brother," was stoned by order of Ananias the high-priest and the council of the Jews, sixteen or seventeen years afterward, whilst they were awaiting the arrival of Albinus, the successor of Festus, at Jerusalem.[3]

Jude, also, at the head of his epistle, has showed his belief that he could in no way better recommend himself to the respect of the churches than by simply styling himself "Jude, servant of Jesus Christ, *and brother of James*," so great was the celebrity of this holy apostle among all the people of God, and probably that of his epistle also. And

[1] Antiq. Lib. xx. chap. 8. Eusebius, H. E. Lib. ii. chap. i.

[2] This name is, however, not the same as Alpheus. And, as we shall yet show, it remains very doubtful whether James was not the Lord's cousin, rather than *own brother*.

[3] Albinus had already arrived Oct. A. D. 61, at the feast of Tabernacles (Josephus, Jewish Wars, Lib. vi. 31).

it is, too, for that reason, as Theodoret thinks,[1] that Paul himself made allusion to James, bishop of the Hebrews, and to his martyrdom, when writing to the Hebrews: "Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God, whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation" (xiii. 7).

The epistle of James having, then, for its author so considerable a person, — one of the "three pillars," a brother of Jude, a brother of Jesus Christ, an aged bishop, possessed of an immense influence among Christians, and even honored by all the Jewish people; an apostle, in fine, who, it is said, had been the only one who never left Jerusalem, and who had for a quarter-century governed[2] this mother church, which contained already at least fifty or sixty thousand Jews,[3] — the epistle of James, addressed by such a man, to those "twelve Jewish tribes scattered abroad," who came annually to the feasts at Jerusalem, — this epistle, we say, must have met a ready reception among all the Hebrew Christians of Palestine and the East; and they in their turn must have spread it throughout the countries into which they were dispersed.

Its immediate Admission among all that portion of the Church to which it was at first addressed.

We see that the eastern church has, from the first, received this Scripture as authentic, and that the earliest Fathers have used it. In particular we may abundantly prove that it was immediately admitted and continually revered as a book of God by all the Israelitish Christians.

We find the most decisive proof of this fact in the translation of this epistle by the Syrians from the first century, in

[1] Comment. on Hebr. xiii. 7.

[2] We say "governed," without pretending to decide anything as to the form of administration which the churches in so large a city had then adopted.

[3] Acts xxi. 20 (*πόσαι μυριάδες*).

their famous Peshito, a version, we have heretofore said, imputed to the apostolical age, which was made so early (at Odessa in Mesopotamia) that the two last letters of John, the second of Peter, and that of Jude, with the Apocalypse,[1] came too late to be inserted in it.

Now, this immediate admission of the epistle of James by such churches presents us an argument of the greatest weight in its favor, since we can not imagine better judges of its authenticity than those very Christians among whom James had labored for twenty-seven years, and to whom he had directly addressed it.

This Scripture, then, was received as inspired in the very age of its author, in the very places where he had so long preached, and by the very men who were the best qualified to appreciate his character, his divine mission, and the authenticity of his letter.

Yet Eusebius places it among the books that *some contest.* Kirchhofer[2] says, "The doubt probably arose from the uncertainty as to which of the Jameses wrote it, for we can never invoke against it any historical testimony."

Its Date.

We can not doubt that the epistle was written about the end of James's life; for when we study it at the point of view of its date, we recognize numerous signs of an epoch comparatively late. The abundant dispersion of the Israelitish Christians, their organization already become complete and their degeneracy already far advanced, their forgetfulness of the characteristics of justifying faith, the influence of their wealth, the care the apostle found it necessary to exercise in reminding them of the place of works in the order of grace, the high authority he had then acquired in the

[1] Hug, however, we have before said, thinks the Apocalypse was inserted afterwards, and for a time in the Peshito.

[2] Geschichte des N. T. Canons, &c., p. 256. Zurich, 1842.

churches of the Jews, the long experience which his language indicates, — all these features united conduct us to the adoption of a date for this epistle already far posterior to the first formation of the Christian churches.

Cause of the Hesitation of some Churches.

If, on the one hand, the epistle was immediately and universally admitted by these "twelve tribes scattered abroad," that is, by all the Jewish-Christians of Palestine, Mesopotamia, Egypt, and Asia Minor, to whom James had addressed it, as also by the Gentile churches in more intimate relations with the Christian synagogues, and by the earliest Fathers, we can easily understand, on the other hand, why some few were slow to receive it, and why the testimonies in its favor, during the first and second centuries, were comparatively limited.

In fact, not only were they further removed from this man of God who never left the city of Jerusalem until his martyrdom, and who had, it seems, received as his special charge for twenty-seven years, the constant superintendence of this mother church, but especially many of them lost, by the misfortunes of the Jews, the facilities they would otherwise have enjoyed, of taking immediate and satisfactory cognizance of the claims of this book to their acceptance. Scarcely had James written it, when already all the Hebrew believers were plunged into the troubles of war, flight, and persecution. All the Jewish churches were about to perish; and we know how profound from that period was their unpopularity, and what ever-growing prejudices the Gentile Christians conceived toward the Jewish Christians.

The letter was written, from all appearances, about A. D. 61, the epoch of the martyrdom of James and the arrival of Albinus in Judea.[1] The oppression of the Jews under this

[1] Others place it in 64; but, according to Josephus, it would be on the 15th of Tisri, 62, that that governor caused the famous Jesus to be scourged. (Jew. Wars, vi. 13.)

wicked man, and soon after under his successor Florus, commenced almost immediately, for Josephus dates the destruction of the Jews from A. D. 62.[1] Albinus then having learned, he says, that Florus was appointed to replace him, emptied the prisons of Jerusalem and filled the whole country with trouble. Florus, in the spring of A. D. 64, came as a hangman rather than a governor, and his iniquities immediately surpassed all belief. The following year was that of all those threatening prodigies which Tacitus and Josephus describe as the precursors of a frightful ruin. The 15th of the following May, Florus, seated on his tribunal in Jerusalem, sent his soldiers to cut the throats of 3613 persons in the High Market; and on the 4th of October, Cestius Gallus, encamping with a Roman army before this guilty city, planted there "the abomination of desolation in the holy place, where it should not be;" and that was the sign announced by Jesus Christ and by Daniel, that all Christians, by thousands, "should flee to the mountains."[2]

It can be seen, then, that in consequence of these extraordinary storms, which followed so closely the appearing of the epistle, and which put an end to the existence of the Jewish churches, the Gentiles, among whom these churches were so soon in such discredit, must have been more slow to receive it, notwithstanding its many claims to their confidence. And it can be seen also that the direct testimonies of the authors of this epoch among the Latins, and even among the Greeks, must have been comparatively less numerous.

Witnesses.

At the same time, it must not be imagined that the Gentile Christian witnesses have been few or unimportant. We may introduce some of high value.

[1] Ἐξ ἐκείνου μάλιστα τοῦ καιροῦ . . . προσκοπτόντων ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον. (Antiq. Jud. xx. 8.)

[2] Jew. Wars, Lib. ii. 19; Matt. xxiv. 16; Mark xiii. 4; Luke xxi. 21; Dan. xi. 31; xii. 11.

And first, we find in Rome, in the first century even, this epistle quoted by frequent allusions of Clement, especially in his ii., x., xvii., xxiii., xxx., xxxi., xxxiii., xxxviii., xlvi., xlix. chapters. We find it, too, quoted in the "Shepherd of Hermas," by seven allusions which Lardner regards as a sufficient proof of the knowledge of it by the author, whoever he was.[1] Also, four times in Irenæus,[2] and also in Tertullian.[3] The quotations produced from Clement of Alexandria are not so certain; but those of Athanasius in all letters frequently name the apostle James,[4] quoting his very words.

The epistle was regarded as authentic and divine by all who ascribed it to James, the son of Alpheus. But those of the ancients who, believing it not to have been written by James the apostle, but James the Just, brother of Jesus Christ, made two different persons of these two Jameses, entertained some doubt, not about its authenticity, but its canonicity, because they supposed that the author, however eminent, was not an apostle.

The doubts, however, ceased at the beginning of the fourth century, and the greater part of the churches were unanimous in inserting it in the canon. We have seen it also admitted into all the eleven catalogues of the same period.

Origen esteemed it to be divine, as many quotations may show, for instance, in his commentary on the epistle to the Romans, his commentary on John,[5] his commentary on Ps. xxx., and his eighth homily on Joshua (which we have only in a Latin translation).[6] And if Eusebius, in his quotations

[1] Especially, Mandat. ii., ix., xi., xii. 5, 6, where the author quotes James iv. 7, 12; Sim. v. 4; viii. 6.

[2] Especially, Hæres., Lib. iv. cap. 16, § 2.

[3] De Orat. c. viii. Adv. Jud. 2.

[4] Among others, ad Serap., ep. i. Contra Arian. or. 3.

[5] Tom. xix. Opp, tom. iv. p. 306, ὡς ἐν τῇ φερομένῃ Ἰακώβου ἐπιστολῇ ἀνέγνωμεν. — Neudecker translates φερομένη by "universally recognized." Others, "put in circulation." See in Ep. Rom. Liv. iv. Opp. tom. iv. 535.

[6] Opp. xii. 412: "Petrus duabus epistolarum personat tubis Jacobum quoque et Judam."

of the opinions of Origen concerning the Scriptures, appears to represent him as being silent about the epistle of James, we ought not to draw from that any unfavorable conclusion; for the same author (H. E. vi. 25), speaking of the opinions of Origen on the canon, abstained from saying anything on the epistle of Jude, although Origen has quoted it more than fifteen times, and with commendation.

Eusebius, as we have seen, placed it in the same rank with the writings "still *contested*, although recognized, he said, by *the great number*." (H. E. iii. 25.)

Amphilochius even, in speaking of the hesitations of some in regard to the five later short epistles, excepts the epistle of James; "received," he says, "by even those who doubted the four others."

It is useless to cite the testimonies of the following centuries, for the canon from that time was definitely fixed.

Many authors have remarked that the first epistle of Peter, which was written later than that of James, contains more than ten passages[1] of morals and of doctrine, which, by their striking resemblance to the passages of the latter, bear to it a silent testimony. "The Holy Spirit could in no better way," they say, "attest its divinity, than by so promptly and constantly adopting and incorporating its language in an epistle so promptly and so constantly admitted by the entire Christian world."

There has been too much reference to the unhappy suggestion of Martin Luther in 1522, concerning this epistle of James, arising from his mistaken apprehension of its opposing the doctrine of justification by faith. But, besides the subsequent retraction of this imprudent remark[2] by this eminent

[1] For instance, Jam. iv. 2, and 1 Pet. v. 5, quoted by Clement of Rome (ch. xx.) also Jam. i. 5, and 2 Pet. iii. 3, 4, quoted by the same Father (ch. xxxiii.)

[2] In all his editions of the Bible posterior to 1526. See Gerhard, Theologia, locus de Script. Sacra, § 279. (Frankfort, 1657.) Seckendorf, Comment. de Lutheranismo. (Frankfort, 1692.) Carlovius, Biblia illustrata, (Frankfort, 1676, fol.) Tom. ii. p. 1393.

servant of God, it must not be forgotten that at the epoch when he made it innumerable frauds were discovered on all sides, in almost every uninspired monument of Christian antiquity: false titles, false Scriptures, false writings of the Fathers, false legends of the Breviary, false decretals of the Popes. They were in his day just emerging from this chaos, and even in the Roman Church men were at length opening their eyes to many of these lies. Still it was not easy to distinguish in every case the real monuments from the false, to recognize the true principles of sacred criticism, or to consult its instruments, of which many were yet undiscovered.[1] Critical knowledge was then confined to the assertions of Eusebius, and it was not yet known how to estimate them. There could be no assurance, then, that the Church of Rome, already so strongly tempted to insert the Apocrypha in the depository of the Old Testament, (committed to the Jews alone), had not equally laid its hands upon the New, to introduce into it also uninspired books; for it was not then sufficiently understood that the Providence of God had engaged itself never to permit any church, good or bad, to be guilty of this unfaithfulness.

Its Excellence.

If it were within the scope of our plan to notice the beauties and spiritual grandeur of the books, while establishing their canonicity by historical proofs, we should call attention to the original character, the depth, and pathos of this holy letter; its perfect adaptation to the wants of the primitive church, as it went among the Israelitish people converted to the gospel; the elevation of its thoughts, the loftiness and noble simplicity of its style. Above all, its incomparable superiority would be manifested by contrasting it with the

[1] For example, the epistle of Clement of Rome, which renders an important testimony to the epistle to the Hebrews and to the epistle of James, and which was discovered only in 1628.

uninspired writings of those early ages. Whilst the latter present so much that is petty, whimsical, and eccentric, here there is nothing of the kind; everything is sober, sage, grave, lofty. And this negative proof assumes great force; it manifests at once the influence of the Holy Spirit with the same vividness as the distinction between the apocryphal and the canonical gospels.

Which James was the Author of it?

If many ancient, and especially many modern writers have appeared to attach great importance to the solution of this question, "Was this James the apostle?" all agree in recognizing him as the *brother of Jesus Christ;* as having presided twenty-seven years over the church in Jerusalem; as having held the chief place among the apostles, of whom he was one of the three pillars, and the first of the three; as having been that James, in a word, so frequently mentioned by Luke in the Acts,[1] and by Paul in the Epistles.[2] But this is not the question, "Was the author of this epistle one of the Twelve?" That is strongly contested. Was he James the Less, son, some say, of Alpheus and "Mary of Cleopas," the aunt of Jesus Christ, or as others say, of Alpheus and that Mary, mother of James and Joses, who remained standing near the cross?[3] Or again, was it a third James, unknown

[1] See Acts ix. 26–30; xii. 17; xv. 13–20; xxi. 18–25.

[2] See Gal. i. 17–19; ii. 2–6, 9; ii. 12; 1 Cor. ix. 5; xv. 7.

[3] For instance, according to Kirchhofer (p. 258), who appears to believe him the son of Alpheus and Mary the mother of Jesus, by a second marriage, and to identify her with the Mary of whom we are speaking (the mother of James and Joses). We read in the gospel of John (xix. 25) that the blessed mother of Jesus had a sister named "Mary of Cleopas;" and we learn that these two Marys, on the terrible day of the crucifixion, were together by the cross with a third Mary, named "Magdalene." Here, then, is the question, Where are these (three) Marys in the parallel accounts of the crucifixion in the evangelists? Where is the blessed mother of the Saviour? Have the three other evangelists forgotten her? That appears inadmissible. We are told (Matt. xxvii. 55), that there were "many women there beholding afar off, among whom were *Mary Magdalene, Mary the*

to the readers of the New Testament before the twelfth chapter of the Acts? In other words, was he called "brother of the Lord" (Gal. i. 19), only as a cousin-german, or half-brother? Was he really one of the twelve, or could he have been an apostle only by the grace of the Holy Spirit, by his high qualities and controlling influence? Notwithstanding many, whether to attack or defend the canonicity of the epistle, have attached so much importance to this question of the apostleship of its author, yet we think this view erroneous. And when the rationalists of our day, to weaken the inspiration of the Scriptures, labor to show that neither the James of whom we are speaking, nor the Jude, his brother, author of the epistle bearing his name, nor the John of the brief epistles, nor John of the Apocalypse, nor the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, nor even the Matthew of the first gospel, was of the number of the twelve apostles, we think

mother of James (the son of Alpheus, Matt. x. 3), *and of Joses, and the mother of Zebedee's children*," Salome. (Mark xv. 40.) Can we believe that the first three evangelists have neglected to name the Saviour's mother in this scene of Calvary? Should we not rather believe that this *Mary*, mother of James the Less, Joses, and Jude (brother of James, Acts i. 13; Jude i.), was this *same mother of Jesus* so often mentioned in the gospels, accompanied by *brothers of Jesus* (James and Joses, Jude and Simon, Mark vi. 3; Matt. xii. 46; xxvii. 55; Luke viii. 19), and whom we see even on the day of the ascension (when she was about sixty years old), accompanied by the brothers of Jesus, in the upper chamber of Jerusalem? (Acts i. 13.) We think the Bible always honors the condition of a *mother in Israel*, at least as much as that of a virgin. It is written (Matt. i. 18), "When Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together (*πρὶν ἢ συνελθεῖν αὐτούς*) she was found with child of the Holy Ghost." And Joseph "knew her not *till she had* (*ἕως οὗ*) *brought forth her first-born son*." (25.)

In every age she has been called "Blessed;" but it must also be observed that the Holy Spirit, so far from wishing to exalt the Son of man by the exaltation of his mother, on the contrary has been pleased to reveal to us all the humiliations of his birth; and that in giving us his genealogy he has taken care to name but four of his mothers in all his parentage during forty-two generations. And these four women, look at them: first the incestuous Tamar; the impure Rahab; then Ruth the Moabitess; lastly that unfortunate Bathsheba, who was the wife of Uriah. The Holy Spirit teaches us to speak of Mary only with honor: but, from the birth of her *first-born*, and in the whole course of the New Testament, it never calls her the *Virgin*, as human traditions do with such ardor.

that their assertions, ill-grounded as facts, have little worth as arguments.

In fact, inspiration was by no means confined to the apostles. Many others than the twelve received miraculous gifts, among them that of theopneusty. A writing was canonical, not because it was apostolical, but because it was inspired. The gospel of Luke, that of Mark, and the book of Acts had, as inspired Scriptures, the same authority as the gospels of Matthew or John; God has chosen according to his good pleasure, among the twelve and outside of the twelve, the men whom he would make the prophets of the New Testament, just as he chose from divers stations the Solomons, the Amoses, the Joels, or the Nehemiahs to write the first portion of the sacred oracles. It was sufficient for the divine authority of a book that it was inspired; and it was sufficient evidence of its inspiration, that it was recognized as canonical, that it was recommended as such to the primitive churches by the apostles of the Lord, and that it was received by them. This was accomplished under the direction of that Providence of the Lord which has caused the successive introduction of all our sacred books into the collection of his New Testament, as it had done for the Old, and which has made the entire Christendom of the East and the West unanimous on this single point for fifteen centuries. This is the fact confirmed by the history of the canon, and which we shall hereafter examine.

In the mean time, without wishing to enter too far into this question of the apostolicity of James, to which we attach only a secondary importance, we believe it can be made probable and almost certain that the author of our epistle is no other than James the son of Alpheus, as, among the Fathers, thought Chrysostom, Athanasius, Jerome, Amphilochius, Augustine, Theodoret, Theophylact, and the authors of the Chronicle of Alexandria.[1] Therefore,

1. It is without sufficient reason that, to deny the apostle-

[1] So have thought in our day Hug, De Wette, Guerike, and Reuss;

ship of James, it is alleged that the title of apostle is not inserted at the head of the epistle; for John has not placed it at the commencement of his letters, nor Jude, nor even Paul in the third of his;[1] and yet all the three were apostles.

2. After the death of James the Great (whom Herod Agrippa slew A. D. 44), the Scriptures have always spoken of only one other James, brother of the Lord, a man eminent in the Church. We must, then, believe there remained only one remarkable person of this name. Where, then, would James the Less be, if this eminent James were not he?

3. The Lord had four brothers, among whom are counted a Jude and a James, besides Joses and Simon (Matt. xiii. 55; Mark vi. 3). Now, Jude calls himself "brother of James" (Jude i.), and James is called "brother of the Lord." (Gal. i. 19.) It will then naturally be asked if they are not the same persons.

4. This is not all. Many of the "Lord's brothers" (1 Cor. ix. 5) were counted among the twelve; among his brothers, a James, a Joses, and a Jude; among the twelve, a James, son of Alpheus, and a Jude, brother of James,[2] both of whom were either his own brothers, his half-brothers, or his cousins.[3] Must we not thence conclude that the James, author of the epistle and "brother of the Lord" (Gal. i. 19), as well as the Jude, his brother, author of another epistle

Winer and Neander are undecided. Origen, Eusebius, Hilary, Ambrose Epiphanius, and Gregory of Nyssa held, it is said, the other opinion. On such a question the Fathers are savants, but neither witnesses nor judges Their authority is not above that of the moderns.

[1] First and Second Thessalonians, Philippians, Philemon, and Hebrews.

[2] Otherwise called Lebbeus or Thaddeus. (Acts i. 13; John xiv. 22; Luke vi. 16.

[3] Many very properly object that it would be contrary to the usage of the Greeks to apply to cousins the expression "brother" (ἀδελφός). They add that Paul and Luke himself, when they speak of cousins, use either the terms ἀνεψιός or συγγενής. (Luke i. 36, 58; Col. iv. 10; Rom. ix. 5; xvi. 7, 11, 21.)

were for the same reason both called "brothers of the Lord," and both counted among the apostles?

5. It would be very difficult to believe that the James of the Acts, of the epistle to the Corinthians, and of the epistle to the Galatians, if he had not been an apostle, could have possessed such high authority among the apostles, whether in the council of Jerusalem,[1] in his house when the elders and apostles were convened (Acts xxi. 18), in the estimation of Peter (Acts xii. 17; Gal. ii. 12), or in that of Paul.[2] "Tell these things to James and to the brethren," Peter said; and it was even from fear of the brethren *sent by James* that this apostle afterward dissembled in Antioch. "James, Cephas, and John, who are pillars," said Paul. "I saw none of the apostles in Jerusalem, save James, the Lord's brother."

6. It would be equally difficult, if he were not the apostle, son of Alpheus, to believe that the book of Acts, in its 12th chapter, would have introduced him abruptly on the apostolical arena as the person thenceforward most prominent and influential in the church, without having said one word about his person or his conversion, and without any mention of him in any other part of the New Testament.

7. It is difficult to persuade ourselves that Luke, at the very moment of recounting the death of James the Elder, whilst his readers must be supposed not to have known, after him, any other James than the Less, should immediately, in this same 12th chapter, speak of a third James of whom the Scriptures to that time had never spoken, and without intimating that he was not then speaking of the only James whom his readers might be supposed to know.

8. But it would be equally difficult to believe that Paul should distinctly and positively call him an apostle (Gal. i. 19) if he had not been one. When, "after three years I

[1] Acts xv. 19, *διὸ ἐγὼ κρίνω*. What would not the Roman doctors say if Peter had held such language?

[2] 1 Cor. ix. 5; Gal. i. 19; ii. 9, 12.

went up to Jerusalem to see Peter. Other of the apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's brother."

In vain should we do violence to this verse by translating it thus: "I saw no other of the apostles, but I saw James;" for no example can be produced where εἰ μή after ἕτερον οὐκ is confined to mean only *but*. And moreover, in this passage the whole design of Paul was to show that for a long time after his conversion he had *not seen an apostle*. James, the Lord's brother, was then an apostle.

9. When the same Paul said to the Corinthians (ix. 5), "Have we not the power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as other apostles, and the brethren of the Lord and Cephas?" it is sufficiently clear that he is far from wishing to except the Lord's brothers from the number of the apostles. On the contrary, he places them in the rank with Cephas. "As well as other apostles" means here "even the brothers of the Lord and Cephas."

10. Otherwise there must have been in the evangelical history two Joseses, three Judes, and four Jameses, which is difficult to believe. Two named Joses: the one a brother of the Lord, the other his cousin or his half-brother. Three Judes: the one, Iscariot, another, brother of Jesus Christ (Matt. xiii. 55), the third, apostle, and son of an unknown James; for we must from thence necessarily understand the expression Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου (Luke vi. 16; Acts i. 13; John xiv. 22), in the sense of *Jude the son of James*. And I say, too, four Jameses: the first, son of Zebedee; the second, son of Alpheus, and cousin or half-brother of the Lord; the third, his own brother, author of the epistle; and the fourth, a James unknown, father of Jude the apostle.

We must then at last conclude that, if it is not necessary to establish the apostolicity of this epistle in order to prove its canonicity, we have still the strongest reasons for admitting that its author was an apostle, whilst those of a contrary opinion are at least unable to prove that he was not.

SECTION III.

SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER.

The Study it claims.

THIS Scripture here calls more than any other for an attentive study of its characteristics and its history; for in spite of the doctrinal beauty and the wholly apostolical majesty which distinguish it, it is, of the five contested epistles, that which the modern opponents of the canon have the most abundantly attacked, not only on account of its lack of historical proofs, but especially of its striking homage to the epistles of Paul, both as to their authenticity and their inspiration.

Moreover, it must be conceded that men of science in every age have taken part for and against it. Against it, because it is, of the five antilegomens, that which presents in its favor the most limited number of Patristic testimonies during the first two Christian centuries; and for it, because at the same time it is, of the five antilegomens, that whose internal characteristics the most invincibly attest its apostolical authenticity. Also, when we determine to reject it, there is, in the strange suppositions we are obliged to admit, "a moral impossibility," as M. Louis Bonnet has so well said in his "Commentary on the New Testament";[1] "impossibility," he adds, "which, in every unprejudiced judge, forces a conviction so vivid, so firm, that we do not hesitate to affirm that, among the books of the New Testament, at any time contested, there is not one the authenticity of which is as certain as the second epistle of Peter."

The most distinguished German critics[2] have lately come to the same conclusion; and we have quite recently seen

[1] New Testament, in his Introduction, tom. ii., Geneva, 1852, p. 701.

[2] Besides Guericke, Isagogik (1854); Dietlein, Der 2 Petri, 1851, pp. 1–74; Thiersch, (1852), Versammlung, etc.

again the learned Guericke, who in his "Beiträge" (p. 175) had at first expressed its doubts on this authenticity, afterward nobly and frequently retracting these doubts in his "Introduction" of 1854.[1]

The Letter claims to be Peter's.

We must first remark that the author declares himself to be "*Simon Peter, a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ,*" just as the author of the first epistle calls himself "*Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ.*" He repeats this assertion from one end to the other, directly, indirectly, and in every form. He professes also to write to the same classes of persons (2 Pet. iii. 1) to whom the first epistle had been addressed, that is, "to the elect from among the Jews scattered" (ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς), as strangers in the various provinces of Asia Minor. He says: "This second epistle, beloved, I now write unto you;" and he assures them that he had been an eye-witness of the transfiguration of the Lord on the holy mountain, "when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory; This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." Moreover, he says, it is now the time of his departure; the moment is come for him "to put off this tabernacle" (i. 13); and this, "the Lord has showed" him (14); this same Jesus who, shortly after his own resurrection, had indicated to him what kind of death his should be. (John xxi. 14, 19.) He then "thinks it meet in both to stir up their pure minds by way of remembrance." He foresees that his letter will be universally read, and in the expectation of his approaching death, he "will endeavor that they may be able after his decease to have these things always in remembrance, that they may know them and be established in the present truth." (2 Pet. i. 15, 12.) At the same time, he commends to them "all the epistles of Paul,

[1] P. 483. "Der ich hiemit wiederholt retractire." See his Gesammtgeschicte des N. T. oder Neutestamentliche Isagogik, p. 472.

his beloved brother," which were already all written, even including the epistle to the Hebrews (iii. 15, 16), although Paul was not yet deceased; for the two apostles were destined to die the same year, and under the same persecution. Paul, he says, had written to them, "according to the wisdom given him;" and whoever should wrest his words, would do it to his "own destruction." In a word, we here see the author addressing his brethren with all the elevation of an apostle who knew himself about to give up his life for his master, and to appear before him. They must then, he says, "account that the long suffering of our Lord is salvation;" they must by their prayers hasten the coming of the day of God, when the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat;" they must, "according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness." (iii. 13.)

The majestic Character of the Epistle strongly confirms this Testimony.

That this Scripture is in fact the work of an inspired apostle is powerfully attested by its entire character, the majesty of its thoughts, the purity of its doctrines, their profound harmony with the whole body of divine instructions. From the beginning to the end, the epistle exhibits one of the Twelve at the close of his conflicts; it breathes throughout the apostolical spirit: authority in the language; sober grandeur in the images; sustained, but tender and serious fervor in the warnings; calm elevation, vigorous and sometimes sublime in its denunciations of the future. The day of Christ approaches, though it be delayed; let men then flee the corruption which is in the world through lust; let holiness of life be all their care; let the Church hold herself, by "all holy conversation and godliness," ready to escape the final destruction of the world by fire! What fullness, and yet what terrible precision, in his description of the final confla-

gration! The earth and the heavens wrapped in flames, the elements melted with fervent heat, that new heavens and a new earth, the abode of righteousness, may spring out of this universal ruin! And it is thus powerfully he at last conducts us to his solemn conclusion: "Seeing then, that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness! Ye therefore, beloved, seeing ye know these things before, beware . . . and grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." "In omnibus epistolæ partibus," Calvin says, "spiritus Christi majestas se exerit."[1] (In every part of the epistle, the majesty of the spirit of Christ is manifested.)

It should then be understood that, in order to put in question the authenticity of this letter, as many have done, not only must the lie be given to all the historical traditions which have transmitted it to us as Peter's, but there must also be found, either in the epistle itself or in historical monuments, sufficient reasons for admitting the following bold suppositions: —

It must first be imagined that a Scripture so grave, so profoundly conformed to the analogy of faith, and so entirely superior in every one of its features to all the uninspired productions of the same and the following ages, should be the work, we say not of an ordinary and obscure man, but of an odious impostor, capable of accumulating falsehood on falsehood, and of carrying blasphemy even to the point of giving himself out as the author also of the first letter which the Holy Spirit had already dictated to the apostle Peter, — even to fabricating the counterfeit of a second letter, and giving it out as divine to the churches of God. It must be admitted that the author having composed false prophecies, and a new Balaam, a new Ananias lying to the Holy Ghost, had presented them as received from on high, and all this whilst exhorting men to holiness of life, and reminding them with rare unction of the terrible judgments of God

[1] Argumentum Epistolæ, tom. vii. p. 243, Berlin, 1834.

against all the ancient false prophets, of his terrible future judgments against false teachers! (2 Pet. ii. 3) — "whose judgment," he exclaims, "now of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not!" Yet further, he went on even to speak of his approaching end, of which, he says, Christ himself had warned him; and this thought did not awaken his conscience. He has seen with his own eyes the transfiguration of Christ, he looks for his speedy return without fear, and he dares to pronounce these dreadful words: "We have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known to you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ!"

But still further; for we should have to acknowledge that such a man must at the same time have been so superior to all the impostors who would afterwards dare to give to the church forged writings, that whilst they always betrayed themselves by the confusion of their ideas, the poverty of their matter, and the servility of their borrowings from the inspired writings, as also by the misfortune of certain details and by manifest errors, nothing of the kind appears in this letter; everything here is grand, true, holy, serious, harmonious; and it is after eighteen hundred years of scrutiny that we can say, it contains nothing not in accordance with facts and with the Scriptures.

You even meet there, in the third chapter, on an important and novel subject, sublime instructions, which, at the same time, are still entirely conformed to the harmony of faith. We should, then, have to suppose that the miserable wretch, capable of such a blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, must have been able to compose an epistle which, by its unity, its unction, and all its excellences, shows itself superior to all the uninspired writings of the same age (the opponents concede it), as much as the Alps rise above our hills in Geneva. And when we speak thus, we are comparing it not only with the apocryphal or forged writings of Barnabas and of Hermas, and the false epistles of Ignatius, but even with

those of a Polycarp and a Clement. For we have been able to detect errors of doctrine or fact even in these holy productions; in the second epistle of Peter, nothing of the kind.

Finally, we must admit even more; we must recognize that this impostor has more completely grasped the design and the real meaning of the first epistle of Peter than any of the ancient Fathers; for when you compare it attentively with the last, as Michaelis has said, you will find their agreement to be such that if Peter had not himself written the one and the other, you would be obliged to attribute to the impious fabricator of the second an understanding of the first which no one of the ancient Fathers themselves appears to have attained.

In a word, good sense, history, logic, and conscience revolt equally against the supposition which would make the second epistle the work of an impostor.

Why its Acceptance was delayed.

It will certainly be asked, how it came to pass that this second letter, so holy and so majestic, was at first received by only a part of the churches, and that the others hesitated, some a longer time than others, to introduce it into the collection of the inspired books of the New Testament? This delay, we reply, was attributable to two causes, one internal, the other external; the internal relating to its style, as indicated by Jerome; the external is furnished us by history. We shall now speak of the former.

Its Style.

Jerome himself, regarding the epistle as canonical, informs us[1] that the greater part of those who in the early ages denied that Peter was its author did so on account of the want of resemblance between its style and that of the apostle in

[1] Catal. Script. Eccles., cap. i.

the first epistle; (a plerisque ejus esse negatur, propter styli cum priore dissonantiam). And even, in the hundred and twentieth of his letters, this Father, for this reason, ventures the suggestion that Peter employed different interpreters to translate the two epistles into Greek; (ex quo intelligimus, pro necessitate rerum, diversis eum usum interpretibus). But this objection, which had also struck Calvin [1] in the sixteenth century, and which was reproduced by Saumaise in the seventeenth,[2] as many others have done in our day, has however little value. In the first place, a serious examination of the two epistles destroys it, by showing that it is not even founded in fact, as may be seen in Guericke's Introduction, (1854). The two letters, carefully compared, disclose in fact more conformities than differences. And besides, we may say in general that nothing is more arbitrary or more uncertain than such arguments founded on style; because the productions of the same author may, in this respect, according to circumstances and subjects, greatly differ at one time from those of another.

It is very true that Peter, in his second chapter, while predicting to the churches the surreptitious intrusion of false teachers who should deny the Redeemer, and who, "with feigned words make merchandise of souls, privily bringing in damnable heresies, by whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of" (ii. 1–3), then rises above his ordinary style, and gives scope to his indignation in the energetic and figurative language of the ancient prophets. But this would surely be no legitimate objection against the authenticity of the book; and what makes this readily apparent is, that it applies, after all, only to the second chapter, and that you might, with the same reason, pretend that the author of this passage is not

1 "I admire the divine majesty of the spirit of Christ in every part of this epistle," he said. But, while recognizing its apostolicity, he adopted the idea of Jerome, "that it came from Peter," but that one of his disciples was employed by him to write it. N. T. Comm. tom. vii. 243. Berlin, 1834.

2 The opinion of Saumaise is mentioned in Wetstein, ii. 698.

the author of the first chapter, nor of the third; for it can be maintained that, except in this passage, the style of both epistles is the same.

Its History.

We have said, there is another reason altogether historical, which explains why only a part of the churches at first received this second letter. It is, the circumstances of the apostle and the Jewish Christians of Asia at the time it was written to them. When Peter wrote it from Rome to the Jewish Christians of the Dispersion, he was, he himself says, on the point of laying aside his earthly tabernacle and being sacrificed for Christ, as Christ himself had predicted to him. It was A. D. 65, so that this Scripture did not reach those Christians until Peter, already a martyr, was no longer living to give by his presence the same authority to this as to the first epistle; and when Paul also was no longer here below to support with his testimony the Scripture of his "beloved brother" (2 Pet. iii. 15). The two apostles had just given their lives for Jesus Christ, with the multitude of Christians immolated at Rome. It was the 19th of July, A. D. 64, that witnessed the burning of that city by Nero, immediately after which commenced that frightful persecution which Tacitus has so vividly described in the fifteenth book of his "Annals." He says, "At first, all who avowed themselves Christians were seized; and then (on their deposition), an *immense multitude* was arrested, who were convicted less of having burned Rome than of hating the human race. They were enveloped in the skins of beasts, that the dogs might devour them; they were attached to crosses; their bodies were coated with resin, and then set on fire to illuminate the night as living torches. Nero had given up his own gardens for the spectacle." (Ann., Lib. xv.) It was during those days of desolation that Paul and Peter disappeared from the militant Church, and the last epistle of the latter, written so

short a time before his decease (2 Pet. i. 14), went forth from Rome to seek the Israelitish flocks in the East. But in what condition did it find them? In trouble and flight. Already, on the 14th of May, A. D. 66, Florus, who for two years had been reducing this people to utter despair, had begun, by the massacre of the High Market, that frightful and final war in which Jerusalem was to fall. The Jewish flocks had all fled to the mountains. Threatened, pursued, wandering, they had carried with them their Holy Scriptures, their Peshito version, which already contained, besides the Gospels and Acts, the epistle of James (written before A. D. 62), the first of John, the first of Peter, and all the epistles of Paul, including even that to the Hebrews, but which could not yet, of course, contain either the Apocalypse, written thirty years later, or the epistle of Jude, or the two short epistles of John, or even the second of Peter. Scarcely had the latter arrived in the East from Rome, than the news of the bloody death of these two apostles quickly followed it there; and we may conceive that, during those stormy days, the flocks could not give to mutual communications on this important subject a sufficient time to secure unanimity of views. From that period, we should expect three facts: First, the adoption of this second epistle would be *immediate* in some churches, especially among the Jewish Christians of the Dispersion; secondly, its successive admission by the other churches would be *gradual;* and thirdly, its definitive acceptance throughout Christendom would be *late.* All these occurred, as we are now to show, beginning with the last-stated fact.

The Definitive Agreement of all the Christian Churches was late.

And first, we have before showed that the acceptance of this epistle was as late as the council of Nice, A. D. 325. It was at this epoch, and without any public deliberation on the subject, or any decree, that by a free effect of the fraternal

intercourse of so many eminent men, this Scripture passed, by a tacit but universal consent, into the canon of all the churches, East and West. All these divergences in regard to the antilegomens ceased throughout the churches after this council. All the seven or twelve authentic catalogues of the fourth century that have reached us, equally contain it: that of Athanasius, Epiphanius, Jerome, Rufinus, Augustine, that of the forty-four bishops assembled at Carthage, that of Cyril, that of the council of Laodicea and of the bishops of all Asia Minor, that of Gregory Nazianzen, that of Amphilochius, that of Philistratus of Brescia. And we might equally have mentioned in this same century the celebrated Ephraim the Syrian who quoted this second epistle of Peter in his Syriac writings and in his Greek writings,[1] as also Didymus of Alexandria, his cotemporary, who, in his chief work, "De Trinitate," recovered in 1769, signalizes it as one of the catholic epistles, and expressly attributes it to Peter.

The Successive Acceptance was gradual.

In the second place, that the acceptance of this epistle by one church after another was gradual, is what all the monuments of antiquity prior to the council of Nice equally show. You shall hear, for instance, in A. D. 324, that is, only a year before the council was held, Eusebius, in the third book of his History (chap. xxv.), relating to us the opinion of the ancient pastors of the Church (τῶν πάλαι πρεσβυτέρων), and placing, as they do, this epistle among "the antilegomens, which, while doubted by many, were at the same time recognized by the majority (γνωρίμων δ' οὖν ὅμως τοῖς πολλοῖς); recognized by the greater part of ecclesiastical authors (ὅμως δὲ παρὰ πλείστοις τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν γιγνωσκομένας)."

Again elsewhere, in the third chapter of the same book, he says, "As to Peter, a Scripture, that which is called *his First*, is universally received (ἀνωμολόγηται). Also the an-

[1] See Guericke, Gesammtgeschichte des N. T. p. 477. Leipsic, 1854.

cient teachers or pastors (οἱ πάλαι πρεσβύτεροι) frequently wrote it in their writings as an uncontested Scripture (ὡς ἀναμφιλέκτῳ . . . κατακέχρηνται). But as to that book of his which is given as *the Second*, on the one side (μέν), we have not received (παρειλήφαμεν), that it should be definitely inserted in the New Testament (ἐνδιάθεκον; literally, *intestamented*); and on the other hand at the same time (ὅμως δέ), as it has appeared *to the greater number* (πολλοῖς) to be useful, it has been the object of the same affection as the then Scriptures (μετὰ τῶν ἀλλῶν ἐσπουδάσθη γραφῶν)."

Valesius (Henry of Valois),[1] translated: "Studiose lectita est una cum reliquis Sacræ Scripturæ libris." It has been carefully and habitually read with the other books of the Holy Scripture.

And as to those doubts of some persons which are mentioned by Eusebius, Calvin says,[2] "They should not divert us from using this epistle, for Eusebius does not tell us who they were that doubted; we therefore owe them no more deference than is due to unknown persons; while Eusebius adds, that it was everywhere received without controversy."

The progressive assent to this epistle before the council of Nice had been slow, in the opinion of Eusebius. As to himself, this Father received it, and *the majority* of the churches were equally earnest (ἐσπουδάσθη) to have it read publicly with the other Scriptures; but we can not yet conclude from all these facts, Eusebius says, that it was decidedly "intestamented." This took place in the year succeeding.

The great Athanasius, already so celebrated at this very epoch, received it without hesitation. We find it frequently quoted in his writings: in his first Dialogue on the Trinity; in his second discourse against the Arians; in his thirty-ninth epistle; in his synopsis of the Holy Scriptures. "The second epistle of Peter the apostle," he says, "was so called by him who wrote it; for Peter, to instruct the scattered Jewish

[1] Edit. (1659) of Hist. Ecc. of Euseb. Socrates, Sozomen, &c.

[2] In his Argumentum Epistolæ, written in 1551.

converts, addressed this letter to them: and it is that which Peter said (ὃ ἔλεγεν ὁ Πέτρος): "Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises, that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature." (2 Pet. i. 4.)

And if we go back a century before Athanasius, even to the learned and godly Origen, in the first half of the third century, we find abundant confirmation of the same fact, and in a manner yet more significant. This eminent man, born A. D. 185, and so profoundly versed in the religious literature of the first and second centuries, received this epistle and quoted it frequently as a portion of our Holy Scriptures, and as a second letter of the apostle. He names it without any restriction, and he even quotes many of its most noted passages, both in his Greek works still extant, and in the Latin translations of others, as may be seen in his Greek Commentary on Matthew,[1] and twice in his Greek dialogue "On true Faith,"[2] as also in the Latin version of his book "Concerning Principles" (περὶ ἀρχῶν),[3] that of his Commentaries on Romans,[4] that of his eighth homily on Joshua, Leviticus,[5] Numbers, and Exodus.

And if we carefully distinguish here between the Greek and Latin quotations, it is because some have affirmed that the latter are less worthy of confidence, on account of the liberties taken by Rufinus the translator. But Rufinus has done this only in certain writings where he wished to conceal

[1] Opp., tom. ii. 55; tom. i. 323; ii. 164, 38; Kirchhofer, p. 281.

[2] He there distinctly alludes to this epistle in saying, Ἀπὸ τε τῆς πρώτης ἐπιστολῆς.

[3] Origen, Dial. Opp. ii. 274; i. 821, where quoting 2 Pet. iii. 15, he says, "It is written elsewhere by Peter the apostle. He says, 'According to the wisdom given to our brother Paul.' And again, quoting 2 Pet. ii. 19, 'For one is in bondage to him of whom he is overcome.'"

[4] Opp. tom. iv. 631. Edit. Bened. 1733–1759. De la Rue. And Peter in his letter says (2 Pet. i. 2), "Grace and peace be multiplied unto you through the knowledge of God." (Et Petrus in epistolâ suâ dicit, Gratia vobis et pax multiplicatur in cognitione Dei.)

[5] Hom. viii. in Levit. (Opp. ii. p. 200,) where he quotes 2 Pet. i. 4, "We are made partakers of the divine nature."

some mystic errors of Origen, and in which there is no question about the second epistle of Peter. Moreover, Origen, in the passages here indicated, is not satisfied with naming this letter as of Peter; he quotes from important sentences word for word, as may be seen in our notes: "It is written," he says, "by Peter the apostle:" "according to the wisdom given to my brother Paul, (*κατὰ τὴν σοφίαν, φησίν, τὴν δεδομένην τῷ ἀδελφῷ μοῦ Παύλῳ*)." Again, he says, "It is written (quoting 2 Pet. ii. 19, Hom. xii.) that every one is subject to him of whom he is overcome." "And Peter says, in his letter, 'Grace and peace be multiplied to you through the knowledge of God.'" "And Peter says again, 'You are made partakers of the divine nature.'" "And the Scripture somewhere says, 'A dumb beast, speaking with the voice of a man, reproved the madness of the prophet.'" (Hom. xiii.)

It has been very unreasonably objected that, in quoting the Greek of Peter's first epistle, Origen simply calls it *the catholic* epistle, as if he admitted only one. This difficulty is reduced to nothing when we see that, in another place, (Com. on Rom. i. 8,) he uses the same expression to designate the second epistle of Peter: (Et Petrus in epistolâ suâ dicit, "Gratia," &c. 2 Pet. i. 2).

This great teacher had then found, in his incessant study of Christian antiquity, sufficient reasons for receiving fully this second epistle of Peter, although Origen says elsewhere (at least if Eusebius, in H. E. vi. 25, is to be relied on), that this letter, accepted by himself, was contested by others. It is in an exposition of the gospel of John, now lost, that Origen, according to Eusebius, says, "Peter has left us one single epistle which is universally acknowledged (*ὁμολογουμένην*); but we admit a second, for it is contested (*ἔστω δὲ καὶ δευτέραν, ἀμφιβάλλεται γάρ*)."

Thus, then, of all the united testimonies of Origen, even including this last, — which however, does not appear entirely to harmonize with the nine or ten other quotations of

this Father, — from all the testimonies united we must again conclude that, according to Origen, the general acceptance of the second epistle of Peter was gradual.

And no one should be surprised at our hesitation in accepting this quotation from Eusebius; for this author has already betrayed, in this very chapter, a grave want of either exactitude or impartiality in regard to the epistle of Jude. In fact, whilst he pretends to be giving there an account of the opinions of Origen upon the canon, he has, notwithstanding the very numerous and obvious testimonies of Origen to Jude, given us the canon of this Father without mentioning the epistle of Jude.

We may again confirm these conclusions drawn from Origen by another testimony equally important, of the same century, that of Firmilian. In fact, if, in Africa, Cyprian, at least in his works now extant, has made no use of the second epistle of Peter (no more than Tertullian before him), we see, by a letter written to this holy bishop by the celebrated Firmilian, that in the same period our epistle was quoted by this learned man, then bishop of Cesarea in Cappadocia, and very influential in Asia. He flourished A. D. 231. A great friend of Origen, who went to visit him even in his distant diocese, and who received in turn his visit in Judea, he wrote thus to Cyprian afterward:[1] "The blessed apostles, Peter and Paul, have, *in their epistles*, expressed their horror at the heretics (in epistolis suis execrati sunt), and warned us to avoid them." We cannot doubt that, by these expressions, Firmilian had in view our second epistle, since the first says not one word about heretics, while the other employs an entire chapter in denouncing against them the fearful judgments of God. The acceptance of the epistle, we repeat, was slow, though real and progressive.

And now, if we pass from the third century to the second, and even the first, we find again the same fact confirmed in the few monuments of this epoch. We must not here speak

[1] Among the Epis. of Cyprian, the 75th.

of the catalogue of Muratori either one way or the other, because, as we have seen, the part of the manuscript which must have spoken of Peter, is wanting in the Fragment. But we find, in the second century, Irenæus,[1] who twice quoted the eighth verse of the third chapter. Peter, it is true, is not there named, but the Father there gives his own words: "A day with the Lord is as a thousand years (*ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς ,α ἔτη*)." And that which proves it to be a quotation is, that Justin Martyr, before him, when quoting these very words, gave them in his day as borrowed from the Scriptures. "*Συνήκαμεν*," he says, "*καὶ τὸ εἰρημένον*." "We know also that it has been said, A day is with the Lord as a thousand years." [2] Moreover, we may see again in the same century, by an important fact, how much the second epistle of Peter was at that time distributed and respected, since Clemens Alexandrinus had written an exposition of it. This fact we obtain from Eusebius and Photius; from Eusebius, who declares to us that Clement, in his Hypotyposes, now lost, had made "abridged expositions (*ἐπιτετμημένας διηγήσεις*) [3] of all the testamented Scripture;" and from Photius,[4] too, who mentions also the commentary of Clement on "the epistles of the divine Paul, and on the catholic epistles (*τοῦ θείου Παύλου τῶν ἐπιστολῶν, καὶ τῶν καθολικῶν*)." Now, it is well known that Eusebius and Photius both placed the second epistle of Peter among those they called the "catholic epistles." Guericke [5] says, "And as to what is pretended, that Cassiodorus represented Clement as having commented only on the first of Peter, it shows that they have not examined the words of that author."

Moreover, in this same second century, we might, with Lardner, quote again Athenagoras, who twice appears to

[1] Adv. Hæres. Lib. v. chap. 23 and 28.

[2] Dial. cum Tryph. p. 308. Lond. 1772, fol.

[3] H. E. vi. 24. De Valois translated "compendiosam enarrationem."

[4] *Μυριοβίβλον*, (Biblioth.) Cod. 109. Edit. Bekker, p. 89.

[5] Last edit. p. 476. (Gesammtgeschichte des N. T. oder Neuestamentliche Isagogik. Leipsic, 1854.)

allude to certain words of our epistle; and Guericke (Introd. 1854), who also quotes a Father prior to Irenæus, Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, with whom we find again two passages quite clear relating to 2 Pet. i. 10, and i. 19. Besides, in the first century there are numerous unmistakable allusions among the apostolical Fathers, especially Clemens Romanus, from which we have already made a long extract. Many, too, are quoted by Hermas in his "Shepherd," and by Barnabas; but we have thus far abstained from referring to these two books. Guericke says, "These very manifest quotations of the apostolical Fathers which we have signalized, may be contested; but no impartial person can fail to recognize in them clear allusions to his second epistle." [1]

Yet we must admit that, with decided enemies, these quotations have little force, because Peter is not expressly named in them, and because they have been determined to see in them only accidental resemblances of thought and language. Moreover, it should be understood that before the book was decidedly intestamented (as Eusebius says), even they who received it abstained from quoting it to others, or quoted it quite reservedly. We prefer, then, to appeal to a testimony more significant; and concluding again that the progress of the book was gradual among the body of the churches, although real, we pass to our third point.

From the Appearing of the Book, the Assent was, in one part of the Church, immediate.

In the third place, it is equally evident, from monuments of the first century, that the adoption of the epistles of Peter by a great part of the primitive churches, and especially by the Jewish flocks scattered abroad, was immediate. This important fact might be inferred already from the unanimity so easily established among the Christian churches as soon as

[1] Ibid. p 472. Doch jedem Unbefangenen unverkennbare Anspielungen. See also Dietlein, Der 2 Brief Petri. Berlin, 1851, p. 1–71.

their principal leaders, assembled from every part of the ancient world, had met each other at Nice in their first general council. How could they then have decided with such entire unanimity and positiveness if they had not seen, in the monuments of the primitive Church, testimonies which have not survived to our day? How, above all, could the learned Origen, so jealous for the Scriptures, so near the apostolical times, so versed in the knowledge of antiquities, have a century before placed this letter in his canon, if he had not had sufficient proofs, and if he had not been able to follow its track up to the beginnings of Christianity?

Yet this proof, which is, after all, only strongly presumptive, might still appear insufficient to the opponents of the epistle. We have another which is unanswerable; it is the testimony of Jude.

Although it seemed good to the Holy Spirit to give the Scriptures to the Church at a period sufficiently late to have them directly in the care of a Christian people already organized, that is, to numerous flocks already completely gathered by the preaching of the apostles; and although, moreover, the greater part of the later epistles may have been written very near the moment when their authors disappeared by martyrdom, — yet the same Spirit meanwhile provided that these sacred writers should have time to be confirmed by each other through mutual testimonies constantly accumulating. Thus, as Paul rendered testimony to Luke, Luke to Paul, John to the first three evangelists, Paul to Peter and James, and Peter himself to "all the epistles of Paul" (2 Pet. iii. 16); so, too, the apostle Jude, "servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James," in his catholic epistles, written after the two letters of Peter (as may be seen by many signs, and as we shall presently show), quotes words evidently from the second epistle of Peter, declaring they were "spoken before of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ" (vs. 17, 18), and the Church ought to remember them. Let us then attentively examine both this quotation from

the passage from Peter and the testimony which Jude renders to it.

See first the quotation in Jude, on which we have already commented. "But beloved, remember ye the words spoken before *of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ.*"

And what words are they? Jude informs us: "They told you there should be mockers in the last times, who should walk after their own ungodly lusts." And where did they say it? Evidently, in the second epistle of Peter, and nowhere else.

In the Greek New Testament, we find them word for word, in the third chapter, verse third, of the second of Peter, who, from the beginning of his letter, called himself Simon Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ. We find them there, and only there. Thus Jude quoted this letter of Peter as a Scripture already known of the churches of many year; for he said "*remember.*"

And he quoted it as apostolical, for he said to them, "Remember the words spoken before of the *apostles* of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Examine attentively the very words which Peter had written (2 Pet. iii. 3): "Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last time scoffers, walking after their own lusts (*ὅτι ἐλεύσονται ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν* 'ΕΜΠΑΊΚΤΑΙ *κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας αὐτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι*)." Compare also now, word for word, the language of Peter with that of Jude: "The apostles told you that in the last time (*ἐν ἐσχάτῳ χρόνῳ*);" that is as Peter's *ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν.* "There shall be scoffers (*ἔσονται ἐμπαῖκται*); that is as Peter's *ἐλεύσονται ἐμπαῖκται.* Walking, (*πορευόμενοι* is as Peter's *πορευόμενοι*); according to their ungodly lusts (*κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας τῶν ἀσεβειῶν*); that is as Peter's *κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας αὐτῶν ἐπιθυμίας.*

And it should be remarked again that the most important word of Jude, that of *ἐμπαῖκται*, is found nowhere else in the Scripture but in this single passage of the second epistle of Peter.

Let us add that, to render again a more ample homage to the epistle of Peter, Jude, in his brief letter, which contains only twenty-five verses, appears to quote Peter again in ten other passages (2 Pet. i. 2; ii. 1, 4, 6, 10, 11, 15, 17, 18); and that, besides, he renders testimony in his fourth verse to the fulfillment of the prophecy of Peter in the verses at the beginning of his second chapter; for the one speaks of future heresies near at hand, whilst the other, writing much later, speaks of them as being already before his eyes.

This testimony of Jude in favor of Peter has, it appears to us, an irresistible force in establishing the high antiquity of the use of this epistle by the first Christians, as of an apostolical writing. Jude, in fact, quotes it to them as a book *written in a former time*, and which he invites them to *remember*. And we must not forget, moreover, that the proof here drawn from this remarkable testimony depends in no degree on its inspiration, since it would still be sufficient to our argument, even if Jude, instead of being an apostle, had been simply a writer of the same age, whose words we now possess. It is enough that his epistle be recognized as authentic and cotemporary. Now, that it is both, is what the opponents themselves of the second epistle of Peter are obliged to admit; for we shall presently show by the most ancient of the Latin Fathers (Tertullian), and by those of the Greek Fathers who have most weight in these matters (Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, and others), that Jude's epistle, which seems to have been written after the death of all the apostles except John, was already received from the second century by the Eastern and the Western Churches. The second epistle of Peter must, then, have been received still earlier; and the numerous resemblances which these two Scriptures present could not originate a prejudice against that of Peter, as soon as it is established that Peter's was the first written, and that Jude has quoted from it.

It is apparent, therefore, that with a great part of the

churches, especially those of the circumcision, the admission of the second epistle of Peter was *immediate*. Afterwards *gradual* and progressive with the other churches, it became at length *universal* from the first half of the fourth century. We pass to John's epistles.

SECTION III.

THE TWO SHORTER EPISTLES OF JOHN.

These two epistles contain altogether only twenty-eight verses; but although their divine authority is abundantly asserted by the most respectable testimonies of Christian antiquity, they were held by many, for a time, in doubt. Eusebius (H. E. iii. 25) has classed them, as we have said, in the number of "contested books, although recognized, at the same time, by the great majority (*τοῖς πολλοῖς*)." He would seem to doubt whether to attribute them to John the evangelist or some other author of the same name. He quotes, too, (vi. 25) a passage from Origen, now lost, in which this Father, while himself recognizing these two epistles, spoke thus of them: "John, besides his gospel, wrote the Apocalypse . . .; and he has left an epistle of a very few lines (*στίχων*). And to these let us add still a second and a third epistle, although all are not agreed to call these legitimate (*οὐ πάντες φασὶ γνησίους εἶναι ταύτας*)." "Both," he adds,[1] "do not contain a hundred stichoi" (or very short lines).

It is easy to render a satisfactory reason for the delay of many in receiving these two latter epistles into the collection of the canon. They were addressed to individuals; they were singularly brief, and the author there mentions himself only as the *elder* (*ὁ πρεσβύτερος*, the elder *par excellence*). We shall return to this subject.

[1] *πλὴν οὐκ εἰσι στίχων ἀμφότεραι ἑκατόν.*

On the other hand, these two epistles are, in their style and their thoughts, so manifestly the products of the same mind as the first of John, that they can be attributed to no other author. The first and the last two render mutual testimony to each other by the numerous resemblances which critics have taken pains to notice, and which we may study with them,[1] as well as by other correspondences; entirely worthy of notice, between these two short letters and those of James and Peter.[2]

Moreover, it might be inquired, why would a false John have forged them? What object can any one imagine any impostor to have had in fabricating these two letters, so familiar, yet at the same time so full of interest as showing the intimate relations existing between the apostle and the churches? They both advance no other than John's doctrines; they recommend no man nor party in the Church; they do not even remotely suggest the smallest of the errors which cotemporary heretics were then sowing with full hands; they breathe only the holy unction and tender charity of John; they are simple and modest likewise; in a word, they bear all the most natural characteristics of genuineness and truth.

Also these two epistles, notwithstanding their familiar character and their extreme brevity, are sustained by the best testimonials of authenticity.

First in the East, from the second century, that of Clemens Alexandrinus, to whom so much credit is given in sacred criticism. He received them both as Scriptures divinely inspired, written by the apostle John;[3] and he has even written commentaries on them.[4] Then, in the West, from the same century, the testimony of the canon, by many attrib-

1 Guericke, p. 497.

2 See Wordsworth on the Canon. Lond. p. 283 to 286.

3 Strom. ii. p. 389, ed. Sylb. Euseb. H. E. iii. 14. Adumbrat. p. 101, edit. Venet.

4 Guericke, Gesammtgesch. des N. T. pp. 474, 495.

uted to Caius, a Roman priest, and published first by the Canon Muratori. Having before quoted from the first epistle of John, he now adds: "The epistle of Jude and the two bearing the name of John are universally received." (Epistola sané Judæ, et superscripti Joannis duæ, in catholica habentur.) These epistles have, moreover, in the East and the West, the suffrage of Irenæus. Although the first contains but thirteen verses, we find it quoted twice by this Father. It is well understood what weight his testimony in regard to John derives from his education in Asia with Polycarp, and his long residence in the places where John dwelt to the end of his life. Now, in his first book (chap. xvi. art. 3), he quotes fully the eleventh verse of the second epistle: "John, the disciple of the Lord," he says, "extends even to such men the condemnation, forbidding us to say to them 'God speed; for he that biddeth them God speed, is partaker of their evil deeds.'" And farther on, in his third book (chap. xviii.): "And his disciple John, in the letter of which I have just spoken, has told us to shun them, when he said, 'For many deceivers,'" etc., quoting fully the seventh and eighth verses of the second epistle.

We might also name, from the beginning of the third century, Origen, who recognized both epistles as canonical, in his 7th homily, already quoted, on Joshua, and comparing them to the priests who carried the trumpet after the son of Nun. He says, "Peter sounds two clarions in his epistles; James also, and Jude; then John adds also his blast in *his epistles* and his Apocalypse."[1]

We might also name, in this same third century, Dionysius of Alexandria, who, in a passage also quoted by Eusebius (vii. 25), cites them as authentic and as ascribed to John, "although John there withholds his name, designating himself in each only under the title of *elder* (ἀλλὰ ἀνωνύμως ὁ Πρεσβύτερος γέγραπται)."

[1] Addit nihilominus atque et Joannes tubâ canere per epistolas suas et Apocalypsin.

Then we might add to all these testimonies those of Alexander Alexandrinus, Athanasius, Epiphanius, Gregory Nazianzen, Philastrius, Jerome, Rufinus, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Augustine; the council of Laodicea, the council of Carthage, and soon the entire Christian world.

SECTION V.

THE EPISTLE OF JUDE.

THE canonicity of the epistle of Jude is powerfully attested; and we have reason to wonder that so short a scripture, which contains only a little chapter of twenty-five verses, has been so frequently quoted by the early Fathers. — The principal of them will be noticed hereafter.

The author of the Epistle.

Antiquity is unanimous in recognizing the apostle Jude, (Luke vi. 16), Jude the brother, half-brother, or cousin of Jesus Christ; and the brother also of that James the Less (ὁ μικρός), who was son of Alpheus, and whose relationship with the Son of Man has already been discussed by us. No voice among the ancients has ever attributed this letter to any other Jude than the apostle: that is wholly a modern pretension. Tertullian,[1] Origen,[2] Athanasius (Epist. Festal.), Epiphanus (Hæres. xxvi.), Jerome,[3] and others, unanimously give the title of apostle to its author.

This Jude, brother of James, who is called *Jude of James* by Luke (vi. 16; Acts i. 13), *Thaddeus* by Mark, *Lebbeus*

[1] De Cultu feminar., Lib. i., cap. iv.
[2] Com. in Ep. ad Rom., Lib. iii., tom. iv. p. 510. (Ed. Paris, 1733.)
[3] Com. on Tit. i. — Ep. 2 ad. Paulin.

by Matthew, and who is mentioned only once in the Gospels (John xiv. 22), was married, if we may believe Eusebius, as were the other "brothers of the Lord," (1. Cor. ix. 5); and his two grandsons, established in Palestine, were obliged at the end of A. D. 95, to appear before the Emperor Domitian, who intended to destroy them on account of their connection with Christ. Yet this prince, seeing in them only ordinary men, sent them home with contempt. They were afterward greatly honored in the church, both as relatives of Jesus Christ, as nephews of James and Simeon, and as witnesses of the truth; and they lived until after the death of their uncle Simeon, who had been made bishop of Jerusalem in the place of James. Eusebius says (H. E. iii. 11; iv. 22), "the relations and disciples of the Lord took part in this election, and made it unanimous."

Notwithstanding all the testimonies of antiquity on this subject, we have seen in our day the same authors who, in order to diminish the authority of James' epistle, have labored to awaken doubts as to its apostolicity, make the same efforts to deny also that of Jude's epistle. This opinion, which is wholly modern, appears to us, as we have said in regard to James, to have no importance as an argument, as to the canonicity of this book. Were it established even, which modern criticism has not the means to do, that our Jude was not one of the twelve apostles (Luke vi. 16), it would not in the least affect the important questions concerning his epistle.

Its date.

The second epistle of Peter, especially its second chapter, presenting the most striking resemblance to that of Jude in its ideas, and even its expressions, it is important to determine which borrows from the other. Now, it appears clear to us that it is Jude. Michaelis agrees with us, and says,[1]

[1] Tom. vi. p. 387. French edit.

"It is certain that relatively to this letter, that of Peter is the original." The following reasons show that fact.

1. Peter had written his second letter just before his death in A. D. 64 or 65; whereas Jude survived the martyrdoms of Paul and Peter, as well as those of the two Jameses. Luke, in fact, relates the death of James the Greater (Acts xii. 2); and Josephus the historian, that of James the Less, (Antiq. xx. 8); but neither of them has mentioned the death of Jude, which antiquity places later.

2. Jude in employing the words of Peter, expands them, because a writer quoting is naturally more prolix than his original. See for instance, Jude 9, and 2 Pet. ii. 11; Jude 14, 15, and 2 Pet. ii. 9.

3. Jude in speaking of the "Scoffers" who walked in his time "after their ungodly lusts," is not satisfied with textually quoting the sentence of Peter, including this remarkable term ἐμπαῖκται found nowhere else in the New Testament; but he is also careful to declare that he is quoting "the words which were spoken before of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ," (17). He, then, is the quoter, and Peter is quoted from.

4. When Peter wrote this sentence, he used the form of prediction, employing the future tense. He said, "There *shall be* false teachers among you," (2 Pet. ii. 1); "many *shall follow* them;" "*there shall* come scoffers," (iii. 3.) — But what does Jude, on the contrary? Speaking long afterwards, and seeing with his eyes the total accomplishment of this prophecy of Peter, he quotes it as realized in his time, and uses in speaking of it, not as did Peter, the future, but the present tense and the past. He says, "*there are* certain men crept in unawares who *were before of old ordained* to this condemnation," (4); and (verse 17): "But, beloved, remember ye the words which were spoken before of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ, how that they *told you there should be mockers in the last time;*" and (verse 19): "These be they who separate themselves, sensual, having

not the Spirit." The one foretold the evil, and the other saw it with his eyes; the one preceded, the other followed.

5. When Jude is pleased at the beginning of his letter to entitle himself "*Jude the brother of James*," it is evidently to recommend himself by association with not a living, but a deceased person, with a martyr whose memory was revered by all the churches of Christ, and whose name was dear even to the other Jews, who recorded his martyrdom, Josephus [1] says, as one cause of their ruin. The churches for thirty years had admired his fidelity in the ministry at Jerusalem. It is then sufficiently evident that Jude wrote his letter after the martyrdom of his brother James.

6. We may remark that, in classing the epistles of the New Testament, the churches were pleased to range their *authors* in the order of the dates of their writings, although at the same time the *respective books* of each of these authors were placed in the order of their importance rather than of their dates.

Thus Paul, who began so early by writing his letter to the Thessalonians, is placed first.[2] After him comes James who died A. D. 62; then Peter and his two letters, the latter of which was not written until near his death, toward A. D. 65; then John, whose letters follow those of Peter; then Jude, because he wrote last of all; then finally the Apocalypse, because it was given after all the epistles, at the end of the first century or beginning of the second. By this mark then, Jude is posterior to Peter.

7. Also Neander thinks that the expressions which this apostle employs in verses 17 and 18, indicate a very late epoch, the end of the apostolical age the time when all the

[1] Antiq. xx. 8, and Euseb. H. E. xxiii. xxiv.

[2] The three manuscripts with uncial letters A. B. C. and the greater part of the manuscripts with minuscular letters, place the catholic Epistles in the first rank. "Epistolæ catholicæ magno veterum testium consensu, eo exhibentur ordine quo Jacobus primus est, alter Petrus, Johannes tertius, quarto Judas." — Tischendorf Proleg. of the Greek N. T. of 1849.

apostles of Jesus except John, had ceased to live. Jude says, "Remember ye the words which were *spoken before* of the apostles, how that they told you," etc.

Objections against this Epistle.

It has sometimes been objected that the ancient Peshito version, which yet contains both the epistle of James and that to the Hebrews, does not contain that of Jude. But the Peshito version, composed as we have before said in the latter half of the first century or the very first part of the second, could contain neither the epistle of Jude, written (Neander says) at the end of the apostolic age, nor the Apocalypse of John, otherwise so generally recognized on its first appearance. The Peshito is said to be the only Syriac version in which the epistle of Jude is not found, but that it is found in those which were published later, some of which are very ancient.[1] Be that as it may, Ephraim, the illustrious father of the Syrian church in the fourth century, quotes it as canonical, and ascribes it to Jude.

It is again objected that the address of the epistle, while naming the author, does not call him an *apostle*. But Jude had no more reason for giving himself that title at the commencement of his letter, than Paul in beginning his letters to the Philippians, Philemon, the Hebrews, or the Thessalonians, where he calls himself simply, "Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ." He had even less reason; for, in calling himself Jude *brother of James*, he made himself immediately known to all the churches as that Jude whom the Gospel of Luke (vi. 16) had already designated to all the churches by this same name of "Jude (brother) of James," (Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου).

1 We have not been able to examine them for ourselves. — See the Syriac version edited by Edw. Pococke, (Vers. et Notæ ad 4 Epist. Syriacas, Petri 2, Johann. 2 et 3, Judæ unam. Leiden, 1670.) — M. Reuss (Gesch. der Heil. Schr. 429) thinks that the four catholic epistles published by Pococke belong to the Philoxenian version.

Was it not fully evident that this title was sufficient, especially in a time when all the Jews, as well as the Christians, still entertained such respect for the memory of that "pillar" of the church, for his long ministry, for his eminent holiness, for his illustrious martyrdom? Jude, *servant of Jesus Christ* and *brother of James;* what more was needed? A proclamation to the French people in 1820, signed Jerome Bonaparte, brother of Napoleon, would it have left any doubt as to the quality of its author, because it did not add his title of King of Westphalia? James, bishop of Jerusalem and brother of Jude, was no less known to all the Christians of the year 100, than Napoleon to all the Europeans of the year 1820.

It is again objected that the epistle makes too many drafts on Peter's second epistle, for an inspired work. But, as to the more or less abundant quotations, we might show by examples taken from either Testament, that it has often been the way of the Holy Spirit to lead an author to repeat the ideas that were uttered by one who preceded him, giving it some new term or application.

At the same time, there is an objection upon which more stress has been laid than either of these. We will therefore, while not regarding it ourselves as any more worthy of attention, yet give it a more extended examination.

Alleged quotations from apocryphal books.

The objection is, that Jude has twice alluded to events of which the Bible does not speak, and which he could have learned only from apocryphal books; the first time (in verse 9) where he speaks of "Michael the archangel contending with the devil about the body of Moses," and the second (in verses 14 and 15) where he quotes a prophecy of "Enoch, the seventh from Adam." These quotations, it has been said, make the epistle fallible, and consequently show it to be uncanonical.

We here mention only these two passages, saying nothing

of the sixth and seventh verses, where some find an allusion to the fable of the angels defiling themselves with the daughters of men. This strange pretension can be maintained only by applying to the angels of the sixth verse the pronoun τούτοις, ("themselves,") of the seventh verse which so manifestly relates to Sodom and Gomorrah, the names of which in Greek (immediately preceding the pronoun) are plural neuters, (Matt. x. 15).

Whatever may be said of this passage, some insist on the other two; deeming with Origen and Clemens Alexandrinus, that Jude evidently quoted, in the first passage, from a Jewish apocryphal book, known by these Fathers under the title of "The Ascension or Assumption of Moses, (Ἀνάβασις or Ἀνάληψις Μωυσέως);" and for the second passage from another apocryphal book, equally known to these Fathers as "The book of Enoch." Michaelis says,[1] "Could we admit as canonical a Scripture which contains apocryphal narratives?" "Because in it," said Jerome before him, "he brings testimony from the book of Enoch, which is apocryphal, he is rejected by most." (Et quia de libro Enoch, qui apocryphus est, in eâ assumit testimonium, a plerisque rejicitur.) Neither Joshua nor Moses, it is said, have ever spoken of the two facts advanced by Jude; these facts therefore must be fabricated, and the epistle must be a merely human production.

But this objection, we reply, absolutely lacks foundation; for it is made to rest on six suppositions not less erroneous than arbitrary.

It is assumed, in the first place, that an inspired man can not make a statement of a past event without having heard it from tradition or read it in a book. That is to say, the sacred historians of the New Testament are merely compilers or memorialists; and Jude, in order to speak to us of a contention of Satan and the Archangel, or of the prophecy of Enoch, must of necessity have copied from some human

[1] Tom. vi. 404, 412, French edit.

book. As if all the succession of Scriptures of the Old and New Testament did not exhibit the sacred authors relating both past and future events, the knowledge of which could have been derived from God alone! It is forgotten that the apostles profess to be miraculous men, led by the Holy Spirit, and assisted by Jesus Christ, who was "working with them and confirming the word with signs following."

We will ask, for instance, in what apocryphal book Moses had read the creation of the heavens and the earth; in what book, that of the light, of the continents, of the sun and stars, of the plants and animals, and of man coming from the dust of the ground and made in God's image? In what book again, the words of God to Satan after our apostasy, or the genealogy of the elect race, from Adam to Noah, with all their names for 2000 years? In what book, the successive scenes of the deluge during those twelve months in which Noah sailed above the abysses; everything on earth having perished, both men and beasts? In what apocryphal book did the holy author of the Book of Kings find what passed in the private chamber of the royal palace at Bethel, between a foreign prince and his wife when, their child being sick, she was disguised to go to Shiloh (1 Kings xiv. 1–4); or again, in the chambers of the palace of Jezreel, between a foreign queen and her husband, when she secretly promised to secure the vineyard of Naboth for him? (xxi. 4–7). In what book did the author of the book of Job learn the scenes of that day when Satan came to present himself before the Lord among the sons of God, and to ask permission to smite that just man in his flesh and his bones? (i. 6–12; ii. 1–7). And in what other book had Isaiah found the name of King Cyrus and all his career, two hundred years before this king was born? (xliv. 28; xlv. 1–7; xlvi. 8–11).

But again, to leave the Old Testament, where these examples abound, and come to the New, how did Matthew, speaking of a time, then elapsed fifty years, learn the dream sent

upon the Magi on the night of their flight and return to the East? (Matt. ii. 12, 13.) How did he learn of the three temptations of the Lord, the action of the Holy Spirit leading him to the desert, the words of Jesus to Satan, and the approach of the angels who ministered to Jesus? (Matt. iv. 1–11). How did he learn of the solitary prayers pronounced by Jesus in that night in Gethsemane, when, far apart from his sleeping disciples, he was on his hands and knees in agony prostrate on the ground? (xxvi. 36–44). How did he learn that an angel, on the morning of the resurrection, before the arrival of the women, had rolled away the stone and was seated on it? (xxviii. 2, 3). How did he learn of the secret transaction of the priests and soldiers? (11–11).

We should have the same kind of questions to propose concerning Mark, and even more pressing. We should ask how, not being an apostle and not having been personally a witness of the facts which he relates, he could be even more abundant and precise in the details than any other evangelist? Where did he find all those minute circumstances which he alone gives, he who wrote so late [1] and as far from the place as the time? How happens it that he seems to have the very events before his eye, with an interest, a freshness of memory, a coloring that an eye-witness could not have attained, unless he were an extraordinary man? We refer the reader to passages of this kind in Mark i. 20, 29, 33, 35, 37, 45; ii. 2; iii. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 17, 20, 21; iv. 13, 23, 24, 26, 29, 34, 36, 38; v. 29, 30, 32, 40, 41, 42; vi. 13, 38, 40, 50, 52, 54, 56; vii. 2–4, 8, 13, 22, 24, 26–29, 34, 36, 38; viii. 7, 10, 14, 19, 22, 26; ix. 20, 21–25, 33, 35, 37–49; x. 46–52; xi. 13, 16, 18, 20; xii. 34, 41; xiii. 3, 37; xiv. 40, 44, 51, 52, 58, 59, 68; xv. 7, 8, 21, 28, 29, 41, 44; xvi. 1, 3, 7, 8–11, 14, 19. In what document, moreover, did he learn that after the ascension of the Lord he had gone to sit on the right hand of God? (xvi. 19). Who taught

[1] As Lardner has showed, and as many passages, like Mark xvi. 20, show.

him this, and all the rest? Was it the apostle Peter, as some have said? Then, who told Peter?

And as to Luke, who was likewise not an apostle, could it have been from Paul, as has been said, that he received the knowledge of so many facts related by him alone? from Paul, who had no more than himself, been a witness of the Saviour's life, and who had not joined himself to Luke until the twentieth year of his ministry (Acts xvi. 10); that is, at least, fifty-eight years after the events of the nativity so minutely related by the latter. In what document then did Luke (or Paul, if you will) find the two prophecies in poetry which Elizabeth uttered more than sixty years before "in the hill country," in her humble dwelling, and which no other evangelist has related to us? In what document, the discourses of the angel to Zachariah, of the archangel to Mary, of Simeon in the temple, of the celestial hosts of Bethlehem? And this unknown document,—who took the pains to write it, and keep it secret so long during the childhood of Jesus for thirty-five years of his obscure residence at Nazareth, and for the twenty-five earlier years of Paul's ministry? Who guarantees to us the exactness of the words which Luke puts into the mouth of these holy personages and these angels? Who guarantees it to us, if not the God of the Scriptures, if not Jesus Christ, "the God of the holy prophets," as John calls him, (Rev. xxii. 6); Jesus Christ, who inspired those of the New Testament as well as those of the Old, and who had said to the Jewish people: "Behold, I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes; and some of them ye shall kill and crucify, and some of them shall ye scourge in your synagogues, and persecute them from city to city," (Matt. xxiii. 34); Jesus Christ, who, in the language of Mark (xvi. 20) worked with them? And if it be asked in what document again Luke learned of either this invincible angel who came from heaven to Jesus to strengthen him, and who appeared to him only, or this angel of the Lord,

also invisible, who came to smite Herod Agrippa, in the year 44, while seated on his throne before the people of Cesarea;[1] if it be inquired who saw this angel, or in what document Luke met the account of him, . . . we must reply: the same document which informed Peter of the secret agreement of Ananias and Sapphira; or Agabus of the future famine of the reign of Claudius (Acts v. 3; xi. 38); or John of the original state of the eternal Word and his presence with God before the world existed; or Paul of the future coming of the great apostasy and the man of sin; or the author of the Apocalypse of the most remote future of the church and the world; as also Jude of the dispute of the archangel and the prophecy of Enoch. Rudolph Stier has well remarked on the epistle of Jude, that "the two passages objected to are explained by the apocalyptic contents of the epistle."

It is then sufficiently manifest that nothing could be more antiscriptural and illogical than to oppose the canonicity of a book for the sole reason that it recounts facts which the author could learn only from God. It would be at once to renounce that inspiration which the Bible claims, and to use a question as a fact. If this book calls itself canonical, it calls itself inspired; and to deny its canonicity from the fact alone that it contains revelations is to say in other terms: this book is not canonical, because it is not canonical.

This first supposition is then inadmissible; and from this point of view the objection drawn from it is seen to be valueless. But it rests upon many other hypotheses no less gratuitous, and no less erroneous. Here is the second.

2. It is assumed that an inspired author can not cite a fact mentioned in some human book without by so doing guaranteeing the entire book. This position is absurd. The books of the New Testament relate many facts narrated in the books of Maccabees, without pretending to render testimony in their favor. Paul cites verses from Menander, Aratus, and

[1] Acts xii. 23. Josephus, Antiq. Jud. xix. 7.

Epimenides, (1 Cor. xv. 33 ; Acts xvii. 28 ; Tit. i. 12,) without supposing that he was giving those pagan writers any moral sanction. And the same apostle, in the second epistle to Timothy, (iii. 8,) without pretending to guarantee thereby the Chaldaic paraphrases, speaks of the magicians Jannes and Jambres, whose names, omitted by Moses, but preserved in the histories or traditions of the country, were found already in Pliny,[1] only forty years after Paul, and are still read in the Targum of Jonathan in his paragraphs of the first and seventh chapters of Exodus.[2] Should we therefore admit for a moment that the book of "The Ascension of Moses" and the pretended "Book of Enoch" had already mentioned before Jude the two facts of which this apostle speaks, it would not thence result either that he had borrowed those facts from them, or especially that in relating them he had pretended to give the least moral sanction to these two rhapsodies.[3]

Those, even of the Fathers, who believed these books to be anterior to Jude, were very far from regarding them as on this account worthy of confidence in all their parts. Origen said, that the apostles, filled with the Holy Spirit, had known what to take and what to reject in such writings.

The objection, then, lacks foundation in this respect. But that is not all ; for it supposes, again, that the apostle, or the Jew who gave himself out as Jude, admits the apocryphal books as canonical. Now that is what the Jews never did, as we shall show when we come to speak of the apocryphas of the Old Testament.

[1] Lib. xxx. chap. 1. He names only Jannes and Jotape. See Winer, R. W. art. Jambres.

[2] And on Numb. xxii. 22, (Calmet, art. Jannes). This scholar places Jonathan under Herod the Great; but Carpzov and Prideaux think that the author of this book is much more recent. See Keil, Einleitung ins A. T. pp. 191, 192.

[3] Proleg. of two homilies on Sol. Song. "Quid assumendum ex illis esset Scripturis, quidve refutandum."

The objection supposes, again, that Jude, the brother of James, (or, if you choose, some Jew giving himself out to the churches as Jude,) would propose to the faith of the Jewish Christians a Greek book, touching the mysteries of a past cotemporary with Moses, or even Enoch. Surely he who adopts such an hypothesis must know little of the estimate in which the Greek writers were held by the Jews of that period, and particularly what Josephus says on this point. The entire first and second chapters of his book against Apion are designed to show that of all writers the Greeks are the least worthy in regard to matters of antiquity. Now the two apocryphal books which they would have us regard as the authorities from which Jude drew what he said of Enoch and Moses were Greek, and were unknown to the Jews. Not an author whose works now remain has ever spoken of them.[1]

But, again, what is yet more strange in the objection is, that it supposes that Jude (or the Jew who gave himself out as Jude) should have publicly expressed his confidence in two such miserable productions as the pretended "Book of Enoch" and the "Anabasis of Moses," to impose quotations from them on the faith of the Christian churches.

As to the "Anabasis of Moses," it was a Greek book known to the ancient Fathers, but now entirely lost, and of no value.

But the "Book of Enoch," another writing equally known to the ancient Fathers,[2] (and for a time, also, lost in the Greek text,) is one of the most miserable relics of apocryphal antiquity. Only small fragments had remained to us, preserved by George Syncellus (a Byzantian author of the eighth century[3]), when the celebrated traveller Bruce, at the end of the last century, brought back from Abyssinia

[1] Prof. Lawrence believes the Book of Enoch to have been written by a Jew. but gives no proof of it. See Lücke, Einleit. in die Offenb. p. 11.

[2] Clemens Alexandrinus especially (Adumbrat. in Ep. Jud.); Origen, (Περί ἀρχῶν,) Lib. iii. 2; and Didymus, (Enarrat. in Ep. Jud.).

[3] In his Chronogr. Scaliger first made it known.

three copies which he had found translated into the Ethiopian dialect.[1]

Sylvester de Sacy says: "This work is not worth the trouble to translate.[2] . . . Such entire confusion of ideas pervades it, that the editor has considered himself obliged to transpose entire paragraphs and chapters;[3] and yet that corrects nothing. He was not obliged to make sense where there is none, and should not have changed their places." He adds: "There are found there absurd repetitions, a fastidious monotony, shocking anachronisms, a striking incoherence; without speaking of a ridiculous system of astronomy, which implies in the author, even at the period when the book appeared, the grossest ignorance. In one word, it is difficult to find any thing more ridiculous and tedious than this book of Enoch; — a singular book, full of fables and fictions. If the brow is sometimes bent in reading it, the temptation to smile is more frequent; and one is astonished that such a book could have had any credit in antiquity. This impression, which will be shared by all who may have the courage to read the entire book, might give rise to the inquiry whether additions made to the original text since its reception by the primitive church have not rendered it still more absurd than it was at first."

Such, then, is the book from which, some have ventured to say, the epistle of Jude has drawn its quotations!

But still farther, the whole objection falls to the ground inasmuch as it wholly rests upon a sixth supposition, still more vain: upon the pretended anterior existence of these two books to Jude's epistle; whereas this priority has for its support only the opinions of some ancient Fathers, frequently

[1] One of the three is in the National Library of Paris.

[2] Prof. Lawrence gave a translation of it in England, (Oxford, 1821, 8vo.) and Mr. Sylvester de Sacy gave an account of this book in two articles of the Journal des Savants, (Sept. and Oct. 1822, Paris, imp. roy.). It is in that we find his judgment.

[3] For instance, six verses of chap. xc. in the xcii.; chaps. lx. and lxx. rejected at the end of the volume, on account of the gross anachronisms it contains; the xx. is placed between xvi. and xvii.

deceived in regard to false books; and whereas we have, on the contrary, the strongest reasons for regarding both these writings as not only posterior to the epistle of Jude, but fabricated for the express purpose of fraudulently corresponding to the words of Jude.

We know with what a flood of false writings, styling themselves apostolical or prophetical, the church was inundated in the early centuries. Awkward productions, all those false books were imagined by an infidel zeal among the degenerated Christians of Egypt and Asia to correspond to certain indications of the sacred writers in their gospels or epistles, and to represent certain books which were supposed to have been made or quoted by them.

Thus, for instance, because Paul, in his first epistle to the Corinthians, (v. 9,) had appeared to mention a prior letter which he had written to them, they have not failed to compose one, designed to pass for the lost epistle, but abundantly betrayed in its very falsehood.[1]

Because Paul recommends to the Colossians (iv. 16) to read the epistle from Laodicea, and which appears to have been no other than that to the Ephesians, (written at the same time, and designed rather as a *circular letter* for the churches of Asia,) they have not failed to compose one addressed to the Laodiceans, known in the days of Jerome, and of which he said, "But all the world rejects it." (Sed ab omnibus exploditur.[2]) Because Paul, in his second letter to Timothy, (iii. 8,) gives the names of Jannes and of Jambres to the magicians who opposed Moses, they have not failed to construct a book entitled "Jannes and Jambres," — a book mentioned by Origen,[3] and placed in the rank of the apocryphas by pope Gelasius.[4]

1 Olshausen, Auth. of the N. T., chap. iv.

2 In Catal. Erasmus calls it a letter "quæ nihil habet Pauli præter voculas aliquot ex cæteris ejus epistolis mendicatas."

3 Tract. xxxv. in Matt.

4 Whose decree, however, is itself regarded as spurious by bishops Cosin (on the Canon, 123, 130) and Pearson (Vind. Ignat. I. cap. iv.).

Because Paul said to the Galatians (v. 6; vi. 15): "Neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature," they have not failed to propose an "Apocalypse of Moses," from which George Syncellus says Paul copied this passage.[1] Because Paul said to the Corinthians, "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard," etc., (1 Cor. ii. 9,) they have not failed to make also an "Apocalypse of Elijah," from which it was pretended by the heretics of Jerome's [2] time that Paul had borrowed his passage. Origen [3] said, "These words are found only in the secret books of Elijah." It was, then, in this same profane and lying spirit of the Greeks that, about the same time, some persons had written the following works: "The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs," of which Origen [4] speaks, and of which Grabe (his editor) thinks that Tertullian also spoke; [5] "The Ascension of Isaiah," which Professor Lawrence, in 1819, published in Ethiopic with "The Book of Enoch;" "The Acts of Peter and Paul, of Andrew, John, and the other Apostles;" "The Apocalypse of Peter;" "The Apocalypse of Paul;" "The Apocalypse of Thomas;" "The Preaching of Peter;" "The Apostolical Constitutions;" "The Gospel of Peter or of Matthias;" "The Homilies of Clement;" "The Doctrine of the Apostles," etc.[6]

It was, we said, in the same spirit, and it was nearly at the same time, that both these works were written, "The Ascension of Moses" and the "Book of Enoch," or, at least, its second chapter, composed merely of the short sentences quoted by Jude.

But there are other reasons which equally show us in this

1 P. 27. Edit. of Paris, fol. 1652.

2 Calmet's Dict. art. Apocalypse.

3 Homil. ultim. in Matt. xxvii. 9.

4 In Jos. i. Homil. 15.

5 Spicilegium, i. 133.

6 The arranged catalogue of all these false writings is found in the two works of John Albert Fabricius, entitled, the one, Codex Pseudopigraphus Vet. Test., the other, Codex Apocryph. Nov. Test.

book, or, at least, in its second chapter, a pious fraud, imagined to correspond with Jude.

First, its extreme incoherence and its evident indications of very numerous interpolations; so that all the critics who have studied it, and even Professor Lawrence, (who, having edited it, must naturally speak in its favor,) are obliged to declare it "written at different times and by divers persons."

Again, the place awkwardly given to the passage of Jude in this book of one hundred and five chapters. This passage, we have said, alone constitutes the matter of the second chapter, which clearly enough determines its later origin and its intention.

Thirdly, the prophecy of the seventy shepherds,[1] in which the author alludes to the chiefs of the Jewish nation down to Herod the Great. The book can not, then, be older than this dynasty, but it may be more recent. And since it afterwards manifestly received also numerous interpolations, these must be still more recent, and the second chapter must be regarded as posterior to Jude.

Fourthly, divers passages which, according to Sylvester de Sacy, betray "a Christian hand," particularly in the nineteenth and last section (chapter xcii.). Tertullian also tells us that the cotemporary Jews rejected this book because it speaks too much in favor of Jesus Christ.[2]

Finally, by the comparison of a great number of passages we may assure ourselves that the inventor knew the doctrine of the Holy Trinity.[3]

Testimonies of the Second Century.

The epistle of Jude is abundantly recommended to us by the most respectable testimonies of Christian antiquity.

1 In chapters lxxxviii. lxxxix. xc. (Journal des Savants, p. 549.)

2 See Calmet's Dictionary, art. Enoch.

3 See particularly chap. xlviii. vers. 2, 3, 5. (Journ. des Savants, Sept. 1822, p. 551.)

Although it contains only twenty-five verses, and was not written until the end of the first century or beginning of the second, yet from this very century you see it already frequently quoted both in the East and West.

It is not only by manifest allusions to its text that it is quoted, such as Kirchhofer[1] notices, as well as Lardner, in Hermas (Vis. iv. 3), in Clemens Romanus (1 Cor. xi.), in Polycarp (ad Phil. ii. and iii.), in the salutation which precedes the narrative of Polycarp's death, in Theophilus of Antioch, and in Irenæus.[2] It is also quoted especially, in the most precise manner, by the two Fathers whose testimony in sacred criticism is sought first of all, — in the East, Clemens Alexandrinus, in the West, Tertullian. It is also quoted by the Canon Muratori.

Clemens Alexandrinus, in mentioning the mere name of Jude, quotes entirely verses 5, 6, 11, in his "Pedagogue" (lib. iii. cap. 8), and abridges the intermediate verses (7, 8, 9, 10). He also introduces verses 22 and 23 in the sixth book of his "Stromata" (§ 3), and the first verse in his "Adumbrationes"[3] on the catholic epistles.

Tertullian, in his book "De Cultu Fœminarum" (i. 3), says, "And there has happened what Enoch has testified to according to the apostle Jude." (Et accidit quod Enoch apud Judam apostolum testimonium possidet.) Now this quotation, made by the earliest of the Latin Fathers, is of great importance; for it is well worthy of remark that our epistle had already, notwithstanding its extreme brevity and its comparatively late date, reached the distant churches of Western Africa, so as to be there generally known and publicly quoted as a Scripture of the apostle Jude.

The Canon Muratori, as we have already seen, contains these words: "The epistle of Jude, and two epistles bearing the name of John, are universally received." (Epistola

[1] Quellensammlung zur Geschichte des N. T. Canons. Zurich, 1842.
[2] Hæres. Lib. iv. cap. lxx. p. 371. Oxon. 1702.
[3] Supposed to be a translation of Clement by Cassiodorus.

sane Judæ et superscripti Johannis duæ in catholica habentur.)

The whole value of these testimonies will be comprehended when we remember what we have already said of James, the brother of Jude, and of Simeon, his other brother, who succeeded him, and did not undergo martyrdom until A. D. 107. If the epistle of Jude was so well known by the Fathers of this second century, both in the East and the extreme West, it must have circulated already from church to church during the life of Simeon. How, in fact, could a letter bearing the name of *Jude, brother of James*, have gained such credit, if it had not had the assent of this apostle and of *Simeon*, and if it had not been really a writing of their brother?

We remember what Hegesippus, a Jewish historian of the second century,[1] has related of the grandsons of Jude. This holy family, consecrated for three generations to the public service of the primitive church in the Central East, may suffice to confirm the testimony of Jude.

Testimonies of the Third Century.

The third century likewise renders a full homage to this epistle in the writings of the most learned of its doctors. Origen quotes it very frequently; he calls it a "divine Scripture," and its author "an apostle;" he quotes the eighth and ninth verses in his epistles; the sixth verse at least once in his fourth homily on Ezekiel, and three times in his commentary on Matthew, and again in his commentary on John and the epistle to the Romans; the first verse in his commentary on Matthew. In his seventh homily on Joshua he says, "Peter represents James and Jude in the two trumpets of his epistles."[2] (Petrus duabus epistolarum suarum personat tubis Jacobum quoque et Judam.)

[1] Quoted by Eusebius, H. E. iii. 19, 20.

[2] Translated, as we have said, by Rufinus, and remaining now in Latin only.

In his commentary on Matthew [1] he says, "Jude has written an epistle, of a few verses it is true (ὀλιγόστιχον μέν), but full of powerful words of celestial grace (ἐῤῥωμένων λόγων)."

And in the third book of his commentary on the epistle to the Romans, in quoting Jude's sixth verse, he styles the epistle a "divine Scripture." (Et nisi hac lege tenerentur, nunquam de eis diceret scriptura divina.)

It is to be lamented that Eusebius, after so many and such striking testimonies of Origen, should have given us the catalogue of this Father in his sixth book (H. E. chap. 25) without making any mention of the epistle of Jude. This courtly bishop, whose history has in other respects so much value for science, must be read with a certain reserve on some points. Lax as he sometimes was in regard to doctrine, he was equally so in his appreciation of the Scriptures.

We find again, in this same third century, the sixth verse also quoted, in sense, if not in words, by Pamphilus of Beirût, in his apology for Origen.[2]

We also find verses 14, 15, quoted by Cyprian, or rather by some one of his cotemporaries, in an Essay on Novatian,[3] found in his works.

Testimonies of the Fourth Century.

The testimonies of the fourth century are remarkably abundant, both in the East and the West.

In the East, Athanasius, in his Festal Epistle and his Synopsis Sacræ Scripturæ; Ephraim of Syria, in his Commentary on the third chapter of Genesis and in his Essay on Impudicity, in which he quotes one epistle entire; [4] Cyril of Jerusalem, in his Catechism; Chrysostom, in his Discourse on the False Prophets; Epiphanius, in his book Against Her-

[1] Opp. tom. iii. 463. Edit. Delarue, Paris, 1733. Huet, tom. i. p. 233.

[2] Opp. tom. iv. p. 23.

[3] Quod lapsis spes veniæ non sit deneganda. Edit. of St. Maur, Paris, 1725, p. 17.

[4] Opp. Græc. tom. iii. p. 62. See Eichhorn (iv. p. 441).

esies; Gregory Nazianzen; Didymus of Alexandria; the false Dionysius the Areopagite; and the council of Laodicea (in its sixtieth Canon). In the West, Lucifer of Cagliari, Philastrius of Brescia, Ambrose of Milan, Jerome (in more than twelve of his works), and, in fine, the very council of Carthage, which is said to have been held under the eyes of Augustine in A. D. 397.

Eusebius places it in the rank of the antilegomens, but adding twice that the epistle was received by the *majority*, and that it was read publicly with the other epistles in the greater part of the churches.[1] It must be noticed that he is the first of the Fathers who speaks to us of doubts entertained concerning this epistle; and we have just seen on this point, in regard to Origen, his unjust partiality. These doubts of which he speaks had no historical foundation; and we afterwards learn, by Didymus and Jerome, that they were to be traced to the pretended apocryphal quotations of Jude concerning Moses and Enoch.

SECTION VI.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS ON THE ANTILEGOMENS.

It must, again, be remembered that if we divide the New Testament into thirty-six equal portions, all that we are going to say of the second canon has reference to only one of these thirty-six parts. And it must not be forgotten that another fact characterizes that slow and silent labor of examination by which a secret Providence finally conducted all the churches, Eastern and Western, to this marvelous unity which they have exhibited for fifteen hundred years past. It is that during this long and conscientious labor, if there were more or less of the churches and respectable teachers who, suspending their judgment, still retained doubts on such or such

[1] H. E. iii. 25; vi. 13, 14; ii. 33.

of the five shorter epistles, at the same time these very epistles had never ceased to be regarded as canonical by a part, generally the largest part, of the Christian churches.

It must, again, be remarked that, in the primitive churches, it was never with the books of the second canon as with the apocryphal books of the Old Testament. The canonicity of the five shorter epistles was at first, it is true, contested in several places; but it was never absolutely rejected; while it was altogether otherwise with the apocryphal books.

Instead of being an object of doubt, the latter were everywhere resolutely rejected from the inspired collection, although they were often respected as "Ecclesiastical Books," that is to say, were classed, as by some in our day, among the writings useful for reading in certain assemblies of the church. But to say that any one of our short epistles was an object of doubt was the same as saying that they expected some day these researches would terminate satisfactorily, and the doubts would be removed. Now we know that, in fact, these hesitations ceased, and that the five epistles, contested for a time, were finally accepted everywhere.

In another part of our argument we hope to show how the churches, although so greatly divided among themselves on every other subject, were prevented from being divided on that of the Apocrypha; and how a Divine Providence has there visibly interposed his omnipotent hand.

But that which, above all, should be noticed here, and which should strongly confirm our confidence in the final results of this long, conscientious research is, that it has always been pursued under the guidance of perfect independence and mutual support. This fact is very extraordinary; it stamps an imposing character on the sacred volume; and we shall have to examine it more closely elsewhere from a more elevated point of view. Certainly, when we consider that the examination made by the early Christians in relation to the second canon was continued for two hundred and fifty years, and that it was at the same time always conducted

in perfect freedom, each divine having been able to continue his investigations and to publish frankly his doubts in regard to any book of the second canon, without leading to any recriminations of each other on this point of such importance; when we see these long and free researches at length produce the unanimous agreement which all the Christian churches have manifested now for fifteen hundred years, — then we receive a powerful impression of the secret and sovereign action which has guided all this sacred affair. But we must, for the moment, abstain from indulging in this train of thought, as we have now before us only the powerful historical testimony rendered by a harmony so free to the canon of the Scriptures.

How admirable is it that in the very period of such ecclesiastical violence, everywhere fruitlessly exercised to secure unity on every other point, we can find nowhere an act of authority in regard to this; no collective pressure of bishops; no governmental prescriptions; no decrees of councils, to impose on the faithful such or such book, or to make them accept in advance of personal conviction the completed volume of the Scriptures.

It was, then, in this way that Christians throughout the world, being gradually satisfied, added to their canon, one after the other, those of the brief later epistles about which some churches had hesitated.

We have already given some reasons for the delay of some early Christians in receiving into their collection the short later epistles, and more particularly those of John and Jude; but others may be indicated. For example, we must consider that, if the epistles of Paul, addressed first to certain persons or certain churches, were from this fact alone received from the first moment (the originals being still preserved in the apostolical churches, until the days of Tertullian[1]), it could not be so with the three short epistles of John

[1] De Præscriptione Hæreticor. chap. 36. "O thou who wouldst more seriously exercise thy curiosity in the matter of thy salvation" (he wrote, A. D.

and Jude, which, not having been sent directly to any particular church, had not, in order to secure such reception, either the authority of a living writer, or the testimony of a depositary designated by him.

In the second place, it was necessary to wait, during this long labor, until the churches, according to their very different circumstances, should also exercise different judgments. Some, better situated than others for a prompt solution of the question, would receive the first canon entirely; others, more remote, had to suspend their judgment while waiting for new light; others again, hindered by certain objections which they had not then the means to remove, were to entertain these doubts and have time to examine them. We understand, for instance, that the Syriac-speaking churches must have received the epistle of James A. D. 62; whereas their respectful attachment to their admirable Peshito would dispose them hesitatingly to accept any thing not found in that. It is thus that one church arrived at conviction after another church, and that all were to be conducted by this labor, patient and sure, at last to receive the entire canon.

It is important again to remark, that it was not even desirable that the five later epistles (we say, almost posthumous) should obtain a very prompt assent.

If the twenty sacred books of the first canon, recommended by the presence and ministry of the apostles, were immediately received, it was, on the contrary, suitable, as to the five epistles, that each teacher and each church, before giving them a place in the canon, should attentively examine their origin, and inform themselves thoroughly concerning all their claims, to guard with the greatest care against confounding the Scriptures of God with so many spurious books, which

207), "go through the apostolical churches, where the very pulpits of the apostles are yet occupied, and where their authentic letters, still read in public, make their voices, as it were, to be heard, and their persons to be seen. Art thou near Achaia, thou hast Corinth. Art thou not far from Macedonia, thou hast Philippi and Thessalonica. Wouldst thou go into Asia, thou hast Ephesus; and if Italy is near, thou hast Rome," etc.

were then so abundantly circulated under feigned names. It was necessary, amidst this confusion, that, in order to judge, the most entire certainty of their authenticity should be reached. It was also necessary that such a laborious examination, which, for a part of the churches, required much time and patience, should be made everywhere, without eagerness, without precipitation, without human influence, and in perfect liberty.

Thus, then, these very doubts in regard to the antilegomens, with which some churches began, so far from disturbing our faith, should only confirm it. In fact, they give us first the assurance that not only the first collection of our Scriptures, but each book, separately, with which it was to be increased, has passed, before being admitted, through a jealous scrutiny, — a scrutiny by the whole church, free and holily severe, without any kind of constraint to force an acceptance of it. Secondly, these very doubts of some churches in regard to the second canon, if we compare them with the immediate unanimity of their reception of the first, also give us three precious assurances on both canons.

And first, as to the twenty sacred books of the first canon, these very hesitations show us that no reason whatever for doubting presented itself to any of the primitive churches in the course of the first three centuries.

And as to the second canon, these very hesitations of some churches attest to us that those who, at the same time, better informed did not hesitate, had found sufficient reasons for receiving the five shorter epistles at their very first publication.

Again, these very hesitations attest to us that, when all the churches, at first doubting, ended by agreeing with those who, better situated, had never doubted, it was necessary, in order to lay aside their repugnances, to have before their eyes the most convincing proofs. Thus they were led by the patient and sure action of Divine Providence to this striking agreement which we find now existing for fifteen

centuries, the admirable result of their researches and their freedom.

It is to this holy distrust on the part of the primitive churches, to their jealousies and continual researches, that we are indebted for another precious fact, attested by history; to wit, that "the church never received any book into the canon, the illegitimacy of which it had afterward to acknowledge." I speak of the New Testament, the collection of which was committed to us, not of the Old Testament, of which the Jews were the sole depositaries (Rom. iii. 2); for we agree, that, in regard to the latter, the priests of Rome at a later day permitted themselves many liberties, though without important consequences; — a later day, we say, because it was not until the sixteenth century of Christianity; — and with no important consequences, at least for the doctrine of the canon, since we know with Athanasius, and repeat with the whole Eastern church,[1] that "the Christian church of the New Testament receives from the Hebrew church of the Old Testament the sacred books of that Testament, because it is to the Jews, as Paul says (Rom. iii. 2), that are committed the oracles of God."

When we say that "the ancient church has never received into its canon any book the illegitimacy of which was afterward proved," some persons, perhaps, may refer to the kind of assent given in some churches during the second, third, and fourth centuries, both to certain authentic writings not canonical, such as the letter of Clemens Romanus to the Corinthians, and even to the apocryphal books or forged books (*νόθα*), such as the "Shepherd of Hermas" and the "Apocalypse of Peter."

But it would be without foundation if one should represent the partial and occasional employment by certain churches of these books in the public readings as a recognition of their canonicity. On the contrary, this fact, examined closely and

[1] These words are in the "Great Catechism of the Eastern Orthodox Church, approved by the Holy Synod." Moscow, 1839.

compared with the general customs of the church at this epoch, so far from compromising the true canon, serves only to confirm it, as Thiersch has well shown in his "Essay on the Determination of a Historical Point of Departure for the Criticism of the Writings of the New Testament." [1]

"At the end of the first century," he says, "the church, thenceforth deprived of the presence of the apostles, and penetrated with a spirit, sometimes extreme, of jealousy for them, redoubled her attachment to the Scriptures of the first canon, and assumed the character of eminent conservatism, which would resist any form of innovation. The use of their first canon was already consecrated and unassailable. About A. D. 130, the generation which had personally known the apostles began to disappear; a few saints, such as Papias, set themselves to gather the last traditions of the Lord's disciples, to preserve them from oblivion; but it was only under Antoninus Pius, about the middle of the second century, that the beginnings of an ecclesiastical science were first seen. Toward the end of that century, in the days of Clemens Alexandrinus and Irenæus, a search was made for the very rare and very brief writings composed since the appearing of the New Testament. Irenæus invoked against the gnostics of his day the letter (ἱκανωτάτην) of Clemens Romanus to the Corinthians, that of Polycarp to the Philippians, and the Shepherd of Hermas; for, to fill up this great void of literature and history, the pious Father appears to have possessed no other remains of the earliest Christian antiquity than these three authors, and, perhaps, the letters of Ignatius besides. Yet these feeble remains then appeared so much the more precious as they were so scanty; so that, if God had not prevented, it would have come to pass then that extravagant admirers of antiquity would have attributed to them more than their intrinsic value. But this was not

[1] Versuch zur Wiederherstellung des historischen Standpuncts für die Critik des N. T. (p. 365 and following, the beginning of his sixth chapter.)

the case with Irenæus. On the contrary, he shows himself very prudent in that direction; and of all the early Fathers he is the most conformed to the Scriptures, as he is at the same time the most faithful representative of the true tradition of the primitive churches. Whilst he was combating the heresies of his day in Gaul, his cotemporary, Clement, who, in Alexandria of Egypt, attempted to mix an impure stoical and mystic Platonism with Christianity, was, on the contrary, the one of all the Fathers who was the farthest removed from the spirit of the apostles, as also from that of genuine tradition; and it was likewise he who most upheld the apocryphas of his day. It is he who first mentions the 'Epistle of Barnabas,' who also quotes the 'Apocalypse of Peter,' the 'Preaching of Peter,' and who even, to refute the heretics quoting the 'Gospel of the Egyptians,' goes so far as to seek a plausible meaning in the mystical imaginations of this book!

"And yet again, even with Clement of Alexandria, the canon remains intact; and you there find clearly expressed the difference which the church made between the divine Scriptures and all the other books. Even when he refers in a literary point of view to the 'Gospel of the Egyptians,' he well knows how to distinguish it from the four canonical Gospels.

"To the very end of the second century, the anagnosis of a book gave it a sanction, and constituted it in the eyes of the church a theopneustic Scripture; for at that time only the books recognized as divine and canonical received the honor of being publicly read. But after that epoch it was no longer the case. From that time the church became very much extended, and worship having taken new developments, the notion of the 'Mystery' was then introduced, in imitation of the Mysteries of the Gentiles; and just as *penitents* and *catechumens* had been carefully distinguished from the *faithful* and the *consecrated*, so they came to distinguish also various degrees in the use of the Scriptures and that

of other books which were read in public. Around the primitive canon came thus to place themselves in a first rank the books of the second canon which the churches dared not yet entirely assimilate to the first; then, around them, some other writings which were regarded as edifying and respectable, but which, although admitted to the anagnosis (*ἀναγιγνωσκόμενα*), and although by that *δεδημοσιευμένα*, as Eusebius expresses it, that is, 'rendered popular and brought into general use,' yet were not *intestamented* (*ἐνδιαθήκα*). From that time, then, the public reading being no longer a test of canonicity, there was formed a new class of books, called 'ecclesiastical,' which had not been used in former worship, and which came to take rank after the books called canonical. The 'Shepherd of Hermas' was read to the catechumens in many churches, and even some other works of an inferior rank; but no one thought by that to touch the canon of the primitive books, and the notion of the bounds of the canon remained complete and universal, as you may be assured by reading Origen, Eusebius, and the various authors we have named.

"Another kind of *public readings*, made on a certain day of the year, was introduced also from the second century in some churches for the celebration of the anniversaries of the martyrs (*ἡμέραι γενέθλιαι*); for the account of their death was read at that time over their tomb. This gave origin to the term *legends* (written to be read). The first example of this we see in the epistle of the church of Smyrna on the death of Polycarp. (Ἐπιστόλη ἐγκύκλιος, cap. xviii.) It was again, by an analogous usage, that at Corinth, after two or three centuries, on the anniversary of Clement's writing his letter to the church in that city, it was read anew. And, moreover, by reason of its antiquity and of its author's name, this letter approached nearer than any other writing not in the canon to the authority ascribed to the second canon; so that Eusebius (vi. 12) teaches us that in many churches, and at Cesarea, among others (*καθ' ἡμᾶς*), it was for a long time ad-

mitted to a public reading (δεδημοσιευμένην). But there was yet a wide difference between this usage and the recognition of a writing as *intestamented.* Also Eusebius, in his famous Chapter XXV. (Lib. iii.), has been careful not to place it, we do not say in the rank of the first canon, but even in that of the second, nor even in the rank of the apocryphal or spurious books (ἐν τοῖς νόθοις). If he calls it 'non-contested' (homologomen), it is evidently in the sense, not of its canonicity, but of its authenticity. He esteemed it very highly, calling it 'a majestic and admirable epistle,' but not making it a canonical book."

It is found, indeed, placed at the end of the fourth volume (or the New Testament), in the famous Alexandrine manuscript given by Cyril Lucar to Charles I., king of England. But this fact has no value in reference to the canon; since we also find, in this very manuscript, at the end of this epistle, the second pretended one of Clement, an epistle of Athanasius to Marcellinus, the apocryphal psalms attributed to Solomon, and fourteen hymns, of which the eleventh is in honor of the Virgin Mary (τῆς θεοτόκου).

"There was still another development of the readings of the church yet later; but only in the fourth century. We allude to the '*Homilies.*' Justin Martyr in his first apology (chap. lxvii.) states that in the meetings of the church in his day, 'after the reader (of the Scriptures) had finished (παυσαμένου τοῦ ἀναγινώσκοντος), the president (ὁ προεστώς) delivered a discourse of exhortation.' But we do not learn that in the second or third century any of these discourses (λόγοι) were circulated by writing. Origen's homilies are the earliest we now have. It is true, they gradually came to read in some churches those of some of the most eminent writers. Jerome mentions the Syriac sermons of Ephraim.[1] He tells us he had acquired such renown (ad tantam venit claritudinem), that his discourses, *after the reading of the Scriptures*, were publicly recited.

[1] De Viris Illustrib. cap. cv.

We know, also, that the same honor was afterward rendered to those of Gregory, Chrysostom, and Augustine. But these recitations, as we see, took place only after the reading of the Scriptures (post lectionem Scripturarum). They could displace preaching from the pulpit, but the word of God, never.

"Finally, there might be, here and there, as we may gather from some very isolated facts, when the limits of the canon had been very solidly fixed, a bishop who suffered in his church, after the reading of the Scriptures, that of some apocryphal or spurious book, if that book appeared to him orthodox in its faith and pure in its morals. An example of this kind is quoted from Eusebius (vi. 12), which some persons would abuse, but which nevertheless serves rather to confirm the doctrine of the canon. It was a pretended 'Gospel of Peter,' which some members of a church in Rhosus (in Cilicia) desired to use, not as a canonical Scripture, but as an edifying book. Serapion, then bishop, states that having come among them ignorant of the book, because he believed it conformed to the faith, he said to them: If that alone causes your dispute, let it be read. 'But now,' he writes to them, 'according to what I have heard, and considering that it was used in favor of the Docetæ, I have read it; and having found, with much that is in conformity with the holy doctrine of the Saviour, instructions which are erroneous, I have placed them before you, hoping to come to you.' He then gave them an extract, with a refutation of its falsehoods (ἀπελέγχων τὰ ψευδῶς ἐν αὐτῷ εἰρημένα). He adds, 'As to us, brethren, we receive Peter and the other apostles as Christ himself; but as to the writings falsely given to us in their name (τὰ δ' ὀνόματι αὐτῶν ψευδεπίγραφα), we reject them, we persons of experience (ἔμπειροι), knowing well that we have not received such from our predecessors (ὅτι τὰ τοιαῦτα οὐ παρελάβομεν).'"

It is, then, in this way that the very accidental imprudence of Serapion serves to show us the ordinary vigilance of the pastors of the second and third centuries, and that the excep-

tion, in this case, as it often happens, serves only to confirm the rule, as Thiersch has remarked.

There exist, as we said, among the seven catholic epistles, affinities and mutual connections; each one of them being a witness of the authenticity of some of the others. We will give some examples.

1. A modern author, Dr. Wordsworth, in his eleventh discourse on the canon,[1] remarks that there is an interesting connection between the first epistle of Peter and the second of John. The epistle of Peter, addressed from Babylon to the elect Jews scattered in Asia Minor, ends with the salutation, "The church that is at Babylon, elected together with you, saluteth you, and so doth Mark." The epistle of John, on the other hand, addressed by "The elder unto the elect lady and her children," ends with this: "The children of thy elect sister salute thee."

It has frequently been questioned whether "the elect sister" and "the elect lady" are two persons, as most moderns have thought, or two *churches*, as most of the ancients thought, and as Michaelis believes (who regards κυρίᾳ as an ellipsis for κυρίᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ, an expression which, among the ancient Greeks, and especially at Athens, designated the regular assembly of the people, and which, with John, would designate the church regularly assembled every Lord's day).

In fact, the first epistle of John, according to the tradition of the ancients,[2] should have been addressed to the Parthians, among whom (as Philo and Josephus[3] state) there was an immense multitude of Jews. And thus, in the same manner as Peter would have written his first epistle to the Christian Jews scattered throughout Asia, John would have addressed

[1] London, 1848, p. 277.

[2] Estius, in Ep. 1 Joh. Præfat. p. 201 (Rouen, 1709): Veterum traditio est ad Parthos scriptam esse Johannis Epistolam. Hunc titulum ei tribuunt Hyginus Papa . . . et ipse Augustinus. (Quest. Evang. ii. 39.)

[3] Philon, Legation to Caius, 36; Josephus, Antiq. xxiii. 12.

his first epistle to the Christian Jews scattered in Babylon and the other Parthian provinces.

Now Clemens Alexandrinus, in a book of which we have only a Latin translation,[1] would also have said "that the second epistle of John is addressed to the Parthians;" but the Latin translator, having taken παρθίους for παρθένους, translated: Secunda Johannis epistola, quæ ad virgines inscripta . . . ; while there is not a single word about *virgins* there. And the same Clement says elsewhere that "this second letter of John is written to a certain elect Babylonian," and thinks, with Jerome, that the word *elect* there designates, not an elect *person*, but an elect *church*.

Thus, then, the apostle of the Circumcision would address from Babylon his first letter to the Jews of the Asiatic Dispersion, a province assigned to John, and close it with this salutation: "Your co-elect sister, she who is at Babylon, salutes you, as does also Mark, my son;" and on his part, John, the apostle of the provinces of Asia,[2] would address his, "To the elect church (the κυρία ἐκλεκτῇ), and to her children, whom he loves in the truth," and then close it in his turn with this salutation: "The children of thy co-elect sister salute thee, thee, their elect sister who art at Babylon;" that is, "thee, who dost inhabit in such great numbers this queen city whence came the Dispersion of Asia."

It must be remembered here that there was a *threefold* dispersion of the Jews, as Luke describes it, on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii. 8): 1. "Parthians, Medes, Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia;" that was the dispersion subjected to the Parthians, with Babylon for the metropolis. 2. Those who inhabit "Judea and Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia (Minor), Phrygia and Pamphylia;" that was the dispersion of Asia. 3. "Egypt and the parts of Lybia about Cyrene;" that was the dispersion of Africa. Thus these

[1] Adumbrat. pp. 10, 11.

[2] The reader must remember that Asia was the ancient name of the western part of Asia Minor. — *Tr.*

three dispersions, whom Peter addressed on the day of Pentecost, and who formed his spiritual province, must have been, each of them, the object of his apostolical care; that of Babylon, by the visit which he made them in person; that of Asia, by the letter which he wrote them from Babylon; that of Africa, by the messenger whom he sent to them, his son Mark, first bishop of Alexandria.[1]

These first relations between the catholic epistles, although established upon a questionable interpretation, have appeared to us worthy of our attention. But we have others also.

2. Peter, writing his first letter after that of James, renders him an indirect, but significant, testimony, in adopting and incorporating many of its traits, as we have seen.

3. Jude, whose letter followed not only that of James, but even the second of Peter, commends himself, from the beginning, as the brother of James who was known to the churches by his ministry, his epistle, and his martyrdom. (A. D. 62.)

4. The same Jude abundantly adopts, as we have said, the language of the second epistle of Peter; as Peter, in his first, had adopted that of James.

5. Jude goes even so far as to declare that he quotes one of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ (ver. 17), when he repeats in express terms a prophecy of the second epistle of Peter.

6. Peter, in his turn, in his second epistle, strongly commends "all the epistles of Paul," "his beloved brother," placing them in the rank of "the other Scriptures," and denouncing eternal perdition on him who "wrests" them.

7. The same Peter, in his second letter, appeals to the first (iii. 1).

8. John binds and corroborates the fourfold testimony of his gospel and of his three epistles by recalling, in a most striking manner, the same thoughts and expressions.

9. As John, in the fourth gospel, attests the authenticity

[1] Jerome, Catal. Script. Eccles. viii.

of the three others by the very pains he has taken to be silent about almost every event already related in them, so we may say, that, in his three epistles, this same apostle has attested the authenticity of the epistles of Peter and Paul, by the silence he keeps on the important doctrines already so abundantly set forth by these two great apostles. In expatiating only on the precepts of Christian love, John shows us silently the entire approbation he gave to their teachings. This is a reflection of Dr. Wordsworth.[1]

[1] On the Canon (London, 1848), p. 285.

CHAPTER FIFTH.

HISTORY OF THE CANON SINCE THE BEGINNING OF THE FOURTH CENTURY.

The Unanimity of all the Churches.

Among the astonishing and permanent facts revealing to us the hand of God the most wonderful is the marvelous, universal, immovable unanimity with which all the churches of the world for the fourteen or fifteen last centuries continue to present to us one and the same Greek Testament, — its four gospels, its twenty-one epistles, its Apocalypse, and its book of Acts, — without the difference of a word, since none of the churches has ever founded a school on the otherwise insignificant question of the variations.

No doubt there have been seen in every age, and in our day more than ever, teachers giving themselves the utmost latitude of belief about our sacred books, calling their authority in question, imagining a thousand theories as to their history, doubting one book, rejecting another, and even going so far as to deny the divine inspiration of the entire canon. But these have always been isolated men, and individual instances of rashness.

Never, since the epoch in which the canon was definitively closed and adopted in all the churches, more than fourteen centuries ago, under the free labor of minds and the unseen control of Providence, has any general council, any synod, any particular church, Arian or trinitarian, Romanist or reformed, free or national, been known to profess, in its decrees or its catechisms, a rejection of one book of the New Testa-

ment, or express publicly its doubts concerning one of them. And this was true in the age of Alaric as in the time of the Reformation, or as in our modern times; in Europe as in the East or as in the United States; at Rome as in Germany even, where so many audacious systems are constantly produced, and where the incredulity of the schools so often overleaps all bounds.

Such is, then, under the action of Providence, this admirable, I may say this divine, unanimity of Christendom on the twenty-seven books of its sacred code. It is a permanent unanimity, universal, unalterable, and not less firm than that of the Jews for their canon. It is even a unanimity still more astonishing; since that which we wonder at in this family of Israel which has always kept its sacred oracles free from every mixture through thirty-four centuries, this very marvel we have here to admire in all the families of the nations, which equally preserve the New Testament in the midst of their most ardent disputes and their profoundest divisions; which preserve it in the most uncultivated churches, notwithstanding their ignorance; in the most idolatrous, notwithstanding their traditions; as in the most rationalistic, notwithstanding their infidel literature and all the wanderings of their teachers. It is a unanimity, we may say, the more striking that it is only on this one point.

Look for a single doctrine on which they have all been united for fourteen centuries, or are now united; it can not be found. Look again, on the other hand, for a point more important and fundamental, and, at the same time, more delicate and open to contention than this; it is not to be found. And yet never has it been possible for the levity of the human mind, the rashness of learning, the violence of party-spirit, or the malice of Satan, to set men against each other on this single doctrine, — the doctrine most important of all, we said, and the most delicate; the most fundamental, and the most liable to be disputed!

Search the whole earth, search from age to age, for one

church in which this discord, so easy to create, so probable, is to be found. It does not exist.

So evident is it that a concealed but almighty hand has been here interposed, and that the Head of the church watches in silence over the new Oracles as he has watched over the old, preserving them from age to age against the folly of men, because he has promised to preserve the church for ever against "the gates of hell."

In this work God is pleased not to appear, but under his unobserved guidance to leave the churches to act in a constant feeling of their freedom; and that not only without any sensible pressure of his hand, but also without intervention of human authorities ever interrupting the exercise of that freedom, as we shall presently show. And it is thus he has led their common free-will by his Holy Spirit to this marvelous result, so that from so many human wills we all should receive, during so many ages, only one and the same Scripture of the New Testament.

But if we must study and admire this miracle of the divine wisdom watching over the sacred deposit, should it astonish us who have seen it for thirty-three centuries at work maintaining the people of Israel unmixed and imperishable among the nations; us who have seen it through the same long ages maintaining in the hearts of that same people, notwithstanding all their revolts, one immovable purpose in regard to the Old Testament? Should it astonish us if this same hand, ever invisible and powerful, has been able also to make all the Christian churches of the world, notwithstanding their dissensions and their unfaithfulness, incorruptible depositaries of his new oracles?

Gobat, the missionary, has indeed found in unexplored retreats of Abyssinia some Ethiopian manuscripts, and Dr. Grant found some Syriac manuscripts in the high mountains of Kurdistan, among those interesting Nestorians whom he discovered there, living so many centuries cut off from all the other parts of the Christian world. But these can not be

opposed to this universal testimony of the churches. Dr. Grant says, "The Apocalypse and two or three of the short epistles" (not named by him) "still were unknown by these isolated Christians, who did not reject them, but who knew nothing of them, until recently, when they hastened with the other Syriac churches to adopt the universal canon."

Let this important fact be attentively noticed, as it is so manifestly ordered by Providence to furnish, after so many ages, a striking testimony to the canon.

All the churches of Christendom have but one sacred text, — the Greek New Testament, with its twenty-seven books, as you find them alike with the bishops in Moscow, the pastors in Geneva, the Propaganda in Rome, or the powerful Bible Society in London! "To them were committed the oracles of God."

In whatever age, then, or in whatever place I might have arrived on this earth, from the remote days when the canon was entirely formed by the conscientious labors of Christians without the intervention of any human authority, I should everywhere and ever have received the same Scripture; in the days of Theodosius as in those of Bonaparte; among the Romanists as among the Protestants; in the Eastern churches as in the Western, during the thousand years of their mutual contests. I might have asked the Nestorians of Asia fourteen hundred years ago, or the council of Ephesus who destroyed their books; I might have applied, three centuries later, to the three hundred and fifty Greek bishops who declared at Nice that the worship of images is "holy, just, and useful," as to the three hundred Latin bishops who, seven years afterward, condemned it in Frankfort; and so everywhere; and so now, if I would procure a Greek New Testament, pure and complete, I ask indifferently for the edition of the Catholic Scholz or that of the Protestant Tischendorf. Everywhere the twenty-seven Scriptures complete! Everywhere this preserved book of God as he has given it! Everywhere the churches infallibly but

freely led to unity by an invisible power; everywhere their unconscious obedience leading them to preserve the sacred collection of the books. We now notice

The Exceptional Freedom which always accompanied the Formation and Maintenance of the Canon.

Nothing was more improbable in anticipation, yet nothing is more certain in history, than the entirely peculiar and exceptional freedom of conscience exercised in the first formation, the subsequent completion, and the perfect and constant preservation of the canon of the New Testament.

Whence but from God came this surprising and complete absence of all external pressure while this threefold labor was silently pursued in the church, everywhere leading to the same result? How can we explain it without this influence from above, that every exercise of authority, every synodical decree, every intervention of the civil powers, was continually suspended in regard to the most important, and, at the same time, the most delicate of questions?

We have already noticed this extraordinary fact; but it is so unique in the history of the church, that it deserves our more serious attention, as showing irresistibly the divine intervention in forming and preserving the canon. For how, without the action of the Holy Spirit, would you explain the fact that during so many ages, and in all the churches of Christendom, such freedom was allowed to every conscience on the very question on which we should have expected the least; on the doctrine from which all others spring; on the very act of determining the unchangeable code, the judge of controversies, the doctrine of doctrines? How could there have been so much freedom on this single point at a time when there was so little on all others; when decrees were multiplied on points of least importance; when all the churches, East and West, jealous, often extravagantly so, of the purity of doctrine, exacted of one another public

professions, explanations, adhesions, or retractions in regard to every other point of the creed; when they were hurling anathemas at each other for the most trifling errors; when, for instance, Victor, bishop of Rome, excommunicated the whole Eastern church, because they would celebrate Easter on the fourteenth day of the moon in March, instead of the Sunday that followed; at a period when eighty councils were held in one century against the Pelagians, the Nestorians, the Eutychians, the Acephalites?

It is a wonderful and manifestly providential fact, that, on this point alone, there can be found nowhere in the documents of history any account of public constraint, any collective action of councils, any prescription of emperors, — although from the fourth century they meddled with everything else in the church, — in a word, not an act of human authority which was intended to impose on the churches the acceptance of a sacred code, or to force any individual conscience to admit into the canon a single one of the twenty-seven books now constituting the New Testament.

Thus the sacred volume was noiselessly formed, pure, harmonious, and complete; like the crystal which tranquilly sinks to the bottom of the vase from the skillfully combined substances which the chemist has prepared. How is it that each molecule, obeying silently, no longer simply the law of gravitation, but other inexplicable forces, takes each its place in turn with mathematical precision in this brilliant and mysterious unit? The philosopher will point you to the laws of nature, and to the Creator who sustains them from age to age. Just so the Christian, whom you ask to explain the continuous deposit, book by book, in the universal church, until the whole volume is complete, will point you to the free action of the church, and, at the same time, to the invisible power of her watchful Redeemer, guiding the process from age to age.

He will tell you to admire the scrutiny of the second canon by the primitive Christians during nearly three centuries, —

a scrutiny always continued in perfect independence by each inquirer, and with the frequent expression of personal doubts; and yet the crystal once formed has continued unchanged for fifteen centuries. This is to us a seal of the divine hand, and an expression of the divine approbation.

When the entire Christian church, convoked at the call of the Roman emperors, was assembled at Nice, A. D. 325, and in Constantinople, A. D. 381, the four gospels were placed on a golden throne in the middle of the hall, to express the sovereignty of the holy Word. At that time the first canon of the homologomens was tacitly recognized by all the Fathers; but there was much variety of opinion in regard to the second and the second-first canons. No one complained of the difference of views; and this important question was held in suspense. From that time, as we have shown, almost universally, and with no decree or controversy in the councils, the churches came to the same view in regard to them. And although subsequent councils differed as to the books that might be read in the churches publicly, their object, as they declare, was simply to settle a question of discipline, — to regulate the services of the sanctuary, but not to determine dogmatically the number of the books God had inspired. This, we have said, is proved, not only by the fact that these two catalogues were not identical, and yet no one complained of it at Carthage, but also that, long after the two councils, the ministers continued to exercise on this subject entire freedom, without being considered as bound by these decrees of the two councils, and without ever appealing to them in attacking or defending these books.

And to this it must be added, that this unanimity is totally contrasted with the movement of mind on every other point, whether of doctrine, discipline, or government. Men began with different views as to the second canon, but ended with entire harmony. On all other points they began together, and have diverged incessantly and indefinitely. By a convergence, gentle, calm, silent, and daily growing more cer-

tain, they have come to a unanimity on this single point, — a unanimity universal, immovable, and humanly inexplicable, in which they rest to-day, however differing on other points.

And during all that period while the church for two centuries and a half was yet hesitating in regard to the antilegomens, she never, for an instant, admitted one spurious book into the canon. God permitted the church thus to test the genuine books before admitting them, but never to admit spurious books.

The Astonishing Independence of the Church toward the Schools, in Regard to the Canon.

For eighteen centuries men of learning have been attacking the canon. But we witness only their impotence in all these efforts, however eloquent, however learned they may have been, however numerous their adherents, however audacious their contradictions, however violent their onsets.

Witness, in the first century, the assault of the Judaizers and the Ebionites. In vain did they arise in such formidable numbers against all the epistles of Paul; in vain did they reject the two books of Luke. It was amid the confusion of this fierce opposition that we behold the entire church peacefully, but firmly, determining, and determining once for all, the first canon of the New Testament, consisting of twenty books, or rather the sacred collection of the twenty-two homologomens.

Witness, again, in the second century, the great noise which the various gnostic sects were then making around the church. Yet more formidable and far more audacious than the Ebionites, they pretended to combat our canon in the name of science and philosophy. They established lectures in the remotest parts of the empire, and especially in the capital under the Antonines, under Commodus, under the two Severuses, who all granted them unrestricted freedom.

They drew after them the ardent youth, full of enthusiasm for their eloquence and their impudence; they held their schools especially in Alexandria and Rome, then the two centers of science: Basilides, Isidorus, Carpocrates, in Alexandria; Cerdo, Marcion, Valentinus, Theodotus, in Rome. They afflicted alike the Eastern and the Western churches, respecting no book of the canon, here rejecting one, and there another, distorting their meaning, corrupting their text, and associating spurious writings with them. But what came out of all this? Nothing; for the God of the Bible was its guardian. He did not destroy the freedom of man; he brought no violent opposition to these false prophets. To the final honor of his Word, he left them an open arena; he took nothing from them but their influence. And while the faithful men of the second and third centuries were strongly protesting against them, while Irenæus, Clement, Tertullian, Origen, Hippolytus, were exposing their heresies by learned writings, they were mutually undermining one another, and their mutual contradictions were suicidal; so that, notwithstanding the great noise they had made, their schools exercised, after all, very little direct influence on the churches. They unhappily led multitudes of young men astray in the paths of skepticism and death; but they did not hinder the movements of the Holy Spirit among the flocks. And if they agitated the surface, they yet left at the bottom of the sacred vase the holy Word of God producing its blessed effects, and the opinion of the church on the canon peacefully forming itself.

Thus, notwithstanding this great tumult of the second and third centuries, not only may we see the truth of the first canon being confirmed, and settling on its present basis, but we also see at that time the acknowledgment of the five later epistles quietly forming itself in all the churches, and the genuine books separating themselves from the spurious. This acknowledgment and this discrimination were consummated after the first quarter of the fourth century; as

we see the silver and gold in the furnace separate themselves from the confused mass of inferior metals.

But witness, still further, a thousand years later, what was passing in Europe at the troubled period of the Reformation. At that time the friends of letters and of truth, legitimately led to skeptical thoughts by so many new discoveries which unmasked the traditions venerated for ages, so many false books, so many lying legends, false decretals, and false texts, — then, I say, the friends of truth regarded themselves called on to question even the rights of certain sacred books to retain their places in the New Testament. Had they not seen themselves compelled by divine authority to cast out of the temple of the Old Testament the apocryphal books? Was it not, then, natural for them to believe that they were called upon equally to pass in review the very books of the New Testament also? Certainly the moment was full of perils; sacred criticism might easily be led astray, and the cause of the canon might be gravely compromised. But what took place then? So far from this, it came forth from this new tumult of minds better established, and, notwithstanding this very rash labor of criticism, not one solitary church can be found which either rejected one book of the New Testament, or added one to it.

But what were all these trials to which the ancient schools had subjected our Scriptures during the first, second, third, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries compared with those which were reserved to be employed by the most learned of modern theologians? We speak of the most illustrious universities of Protestant Europe, and especially of learned and laborious Germany, during the last half of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth centuries. We might well have said that the old war of the gnostics was rekindled. The Cerdos, the Marcions, the Basilides, had risen from the dead; the revolt of criticism, for a time, seemed universal, and one might have believed that the larger portion of our Bible was to perish before the new researches of science. The

young men of the schools were swept away by the mighty current; the least incredulous professors shrugged their shoulders when they witnessed our naïve confidence in the whole old text; and you might hear it constantly repeated that it was all over with our canon.

But to give a more exact view of this war we need to examine in detail, as presented, for instance, in the "Tables of Hertwig," published in 1849,[1] the literature of the Introductions to the New Testament. We have there the whole successive list for a century. What, then, have they taught as to the canon, all these guides, these "introducers" of the youth of Germany to this sacred study, from the time of the appeal of David Michaelis to the University of Göttingen, in 1751, down to our day? All, without exception, have attacked the canon, with, however, no other agreement among themselves.

Thus, for more than a century, have some of the most learned men of the world labored to displace some of the sacred books by bold denials, fantastic hypotheses, arbitrary systems, abundance of doubts, contemptuous accusations against particular books, against their authenticity, their harmony, their infallibility, their wisdom, yes, their veracity! And what has been the result of all the labor of these learned men? Our New Testament comes forth from this conflict better confirmed than ever in all our churches, even in Germany itself. And at the very time when German universities were denying the divinity of the Scriptures, God was proving it by their mighty effects in transforming the most debased of the nations. The period of the most violent attack on the Scriptures has been the very period of their rapid extension by new translations into new sections of the earth. The age of rationalism has been most wonderfully the age of missions. The age of attacking the Bible was the very age of Bible societies.

[1] Literatur der Einleitungswissenschaft. Tabellen zur Einleitung ins N. T. Berlin, 1849.

It is, moreover, a point well worthy of our attention that the universal adoption of the second canon took place at a time when the contents of its books were directly opposed to the prejudices and inclinations of the churches, whilst the books they rejected at the same time accorded with those inclinations and prejudices.

The beginning of the fourth century was distinguished by an excessive fondness for the marvelous; innumerable accounts of silly miracles; a prevailing disposition to look for allegories, to spiritualize texts and facts to the most foolish extremes; by very exaggerated notions of the holiness of the saints, and very false notions of their merits; a growing tendency to exalt the priests, and especially the bishops; an almost idolatrous admiration of the martyrs; excessive confidence in the virtue of the sacraments, especially baptism; and various other errors of doctrine, sentiment, and practice.

Now, of these false notions not one word is to be found in all the five epistles then universally admitted to be canonical; but an abundance of these notions is in almost all the ecclesiastical books at that day universally rejected from the canon. In the five epistles, not a legend is to be found, nothing puerile, not a word on the virtues of Mary, or her miracles, or even her person; not one word on salvation by baptism, on the privileges of bishops, or the superiority of one to another, except the rebuke of Diotrephes for claiming pre-eminence; no exaltation of the angels. And while the doctrine of the millennium contained in the Apocalypse was so strongly opposed in the East, and the Novatian doctrine supposed to be favored by the epistle to the Hebrews was opposed in the West, not a church refused to admit both these books into the canon.

And all this firm, unanimous, quiet acceptance took place at a time when the dangerous practice existed of reading the uninspired books in public worship. Jerome[1] informs us that it was only from the fourth century that these books

[1] Præf. in Libr. Salomon. Opp. tom. i. p. 938.

were thus read, "not to establish doctrines, but merely to edify." And Augustine [1] says, that Judith, Wisdom, and Ecclesiasticus were read, not by the clergy, but by inferior officers, and from lower seats than those from which the canonical books were read.

And yet, if this dangerous practice did introduce into the Latin church these apocryphal books on account of their false teachings, yet it is remarkable that similar errors in the writings of the Fathers never led to the introduction of apocryphal books into the New Testament canon of that church. Why were the Acts of Paul, the Shepherd of Hermas, the epistle of Barnabas, so promptly, universally, and firmly rejected from the canon? Let us own in this the hand of God; for surely this mysterious work of forming the canon unanimously in all parts of the church, executed at such a period, amid so many errors, prejudices, and so much controversy, could not come from the mind of man alone. Everywhere we see the church accepting reverently as divine the books unfavorable to the inclinations of her members, and everywhere rejecting those which were the most flattering to their pride, and most favorable to the heresies to which they were inclined.

Genuineness of the Text.

But a vital question meets us here: have we the genuine, original text? If we have not, the preservation of the names of the books is of no importance.

For the last two centuries this question has been examined by men of critical science with herculean industry. Walton commenced this work in England by the preparation of his Polyglott in 1657, followed by bishop Fell's Greek Testament in 1675, that of Mill in 1707, and of Bentley in 1716. The task was undertaken to find all the manuscripts of the Greek Testament concealed in the libraries of Europe, and

[1] De Prædest. Sanctor. Lib. i. cap. xiv. Cosin, Hist. of Canon, p. 106 (old Eng. edit.).

to compare them together. The effort startled the world. It was feared that it would result in diminishing men's confidence in the Scriptures. The Germans followed the English, and surpassed them in the vastness of their researches.[1] We know that Griesbach alone in 1786 had compared 335 Greek manuscripts of the gospel, and Scholz, five years later, 674, besides 200 of the Acts, 256 of the epistles of Paul, 93 of the Apocalypse, and still others of the catholic epistles. In our "Theopneusty" we have said: "When it is remembered that the New Testament has been copied in every Christian country and in every variety of circumstances, during a succession of fourteen hundred years; that it has passed through three centuries of pagan persecutions, in which men convicted of possessing it were thrown to wild beasts; that in the second, third, and fourth centuries, false books were multiplied in every direction; in the eighth, ninth, and tenth, false legends and false histories were made; in the tenth and eleventh, so few could read, even among the princes; in the twelfth and thirteenth, the use of the Scriptures in the vernacular was punished with death, and to promote error the writings of the Fathers and decrees of councils were altered; when it is remembered that the learned, not contented with the public and private libraries of the West, went to search even the convents of Mount Athos, of Asiatic Turkey, and of Egypt; . . . then it may be understood how at the beginning of these researches the friends of the sacred Word were alarmed for the integrity of our Scriptures." But what, in fact, has been the result?

It is, that, on the contrary, by this gigantic labor, in which so many distinguished men have spent their lives, a new proof, striking and unexpected, has been furnished the world, of the Providence which watches over the oracles of God,

[1] The labors of Bengel, Wetstein, Griesbach, Scholz, Matthai, Tittmann, Lachmann, and Tischendorf, are well known, as also the recent labors of the learned Tregelles (Account of the Printed Texts of the Greek New Testament. London, 1854).

throughout every age. The text has been found purer and better attested than the most pious men dared to believe. From this mass of thirteen or fifteen hundred Greek manuscripts, sought out in all the libraries of Europe and Asia, carefully compared together, word for word, letter by letter, by modern criticism, and compared also with all the ancient versions, Latin, Armenian, Syriac, Sahidic, Coptic, Ethiopic, Arabic, Sclavonic, Gothic, and Persian, as with all the quotations from the New Testament by the Fathers in their innumerable writings, — from this mass, we say, and from this gigantic labor, the enemies, astonished and confounded, have seen sacred criticism return covered with the dust of a thousand libraries, but unable after all to present the world any thing more than a trivial and valueless result ; trivial, we say, with them ; but we will say with the friends of the Bible immense in its nothingness, and mighty in its very insignificance.

In fact, all the hopes of the enemies of religion from this quarter are confounded; and as Michaelis remarks : [1] "They have ceased now to hope for any thing from those critical researches which they so earnestly recommended at first."

And such, henceforth, has been the complete preservation of our Scriptures, that, to this hour, and everywhere, you shall see all the Christian sects, however opposed to each other, give us the same Greek New Testament, without even having founded one single school on the variations. In fact, all, Jesuits, ministers, popes, cardinals, pastors, or archimandrites ; at Rome as at Geneva, at Moscow as at Cambridge or Berlin, use the same manuscripts, quote the same editions, and produce the same texts, Griesbach and Scholz, Lachmann, Tregelles, and Tischendorf.

We have presented, in the Theopneusty, tables intended to give every reader a simple idea of these results of sacred criticism. The eye must see them, however, to comprehend them.

We have there shown, for example, that, in the epistle to

[1] Tom. ii. pp. 266, 467, 469.

the Romans (the largest and most important of the epistles), all the corrections which Griesbach could make, affecting the meaning in the slightest degree, in four hundred and thirty-three verses of this Scripture, after examining one hundred and forty manuscripts, were *five*, and they small and insignificant; and now the subsequent researches of Tittmann and Lachmann have reduced these five to *two;* (Scholz, more recently, reduced them to *one*). The first (Rom. vii. 6) embraces the difference between the letters ε and ο. Instead of "that being dead in which we were held," Griesbach reads, "we being dead," etc. The second, in the eleventh chapter, retrenches the part which is parallel to the sixth verse. The third (xvi. 5) substitutes Achaia for Asia.

In a word, in the 7959 verses of the New Testament there are but ten or twelve in which all the corrections proposed by Griesbach and so many others, at the end of their immense researches, have any importance. And eight of these corrections pertain to either single words or single letters.

Such, therefore, has been the astonishing preservation of our sacred text through such a series of ages; such is the testimony of the manuscripts; and it is thus that science, which has collected them, has brought to our view a magnificent monument of Providence ever actively watching over the Scriptures.

We have, then, the strongest possible evidence of the genuineness of our text.

There remains but one other question in regard to the New Testament canon. It has been declared, that, if the books we possess are inspired, the present canon of the New Testament is incomplete, because we have not in it all the originally inspired books. This point we now proceed to examine.

The Books alleged to be lost.

Have we a complete canon; or have any inspired books of the New Testament been lost?

It has been affirmed that there was an epistle to the Laodiceans written by Paul.

No Father ever saw this pretended epistle, and there was never a question whether it should be put into the canon. In Jerome's trial, about A. D. 400, there was one shown, it is said, which was universally "rejected," [1] and which, an impostor had imagined, corresponded to the description Paul gave of a letter to the Laodiceans, in his letter to the Colossians (iv. 16). Calvin remarks: "Now that is too gross a deception that any one should dare, under so stupid and foolish a pretense, exhibit a letter so contrary to the mind of Paul." [2] But besides, not only does no Father pretend to have seen the true epistle of Paul, but he himself does not pretend to have written one; "And they," Calvin says, "are doubly deceived who think Paul wrote that to the Laodiceans."

Paul, in that passage alluded to, contents himself with recommending to the Colossians to have the epistle (*τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικείας*), *coming from Laodicea*, read by them; that is, as Calvin says, "an epistle sent from Laodicea to Paul, and which he had judged it well to have the Colossians read;" or, according to others, an epistle of Paul which was to pass from Laodicea to Colosse. And what epistle? Undoubtedly that which he had written to the Ephesians at the same time, and which, as it is not directed "to the elders and deacons" of that city, was rather, as many think, a circular letter.

But another is spoken of. Many have imagined, according to certain equivocal words of Paul to the Corinthians (1 Cor. v. 9), that this apostle, before his two canonical epistles, had written them another, which was "unfortunately lost," or which, at least, not having been designed to be a part of the sacred oracles, was never inserted in the canon. That letter, we reply, was not lost, for it never had an existence.

[1] In Catal. "ab omnibus exploditur."

[2] Com. on Col. tom. iv. p. 107. Paris, 1855.

It is true that here again a more modern impostor, taking occasion from these words of Paul, has attempted to fabricate one of which we shall say nothing, because it has never obtained the least credit, and the anachronisms it contains betray its spurious character. Moreover, no Father has professed ever to have seen this pretended epistle of Paul which is asserted to have been "lost."

The fact is, Paul's very simple language has been entirely misapprehended. "I wrote unto you in an epistle not to company with fornicators." He does not say, as some translators have inaccurately rendered it: "*I have written to you in a letter*" but *in the letter* (ἔγραψα ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ ἐπιστόλῃ), that is to say, *in this letter;* for that is the meaning of the definite article with the Greeks, when it is substituted for the demonstrative pronoun;[1] and it is thus that all the translators have understood this very expression in the four other passages of the New Testament where it occurs: —

Rom. xvi. 22: "I, Tertius, who wrote this epistle." It is: "who wrote *the epistle.*"

Col. iv. 16: "And when this is read among you." It is: "And when *the letter.*"

1 Thess. v. 27: "I charge you by the Lord that this epistle be read unto all the holy brethren." It is: "That *the epistle* be read."

2 Thess. iii. 14: "And if any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man." It is: "*by the epistle.*"

"I then have written to you," or I wrote (ἔγραψα) "in this letter," says the apostle, "not to company with fornicators." We perceive that the apostle is not opposing that which he is writing to-day to that which he had written in a previous letter; one tense of a verb to another; γράφω to ἔγραψα; but it is the aorist ἔγραψα in both successive members of the phrase, which are in no wise adversative to each other; the second being only a development of the first, and the aorist of this verb being freely employed elsewhere in the present

[1] See the beautiful work of bishop Middleton on the article.

time.[1] Paul then reminds the Corinthians that on the occasion of the scandal *of which he has here spoken to them for the first time*, he has just been exhorting them in this very epistle (eight verses before) to have no fellowship with men who, professing to be Christians, were living in immoral practices. "We everywhere hear of you practicing an impurity that is not even named among the heathen! And yet you are puffed up! And you have not rather been in mourning, that he who has committed such a crime might be cut off from among you! But I . . . in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, you and my spirit being assembled together with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, have adjudged such a man to be delivered to Satan. Take then the wicked man from the midst of you. . . ."

Then, four verses afterward, and without leaving the subject, he adds: "I write to you in this letter that you do not company with fornicators. . . . Now, I write to you that you company not with any one calling himself a brother," etc.

Such is the natural sense of the passage without any question about a former letter, or a "lost epistle."

Do we mean to say by this, that Paul, having the care of all the churches daily upon him, wrote, either to the brethren or the churches, only fourteen letters during a ministry of thirty years? Certainly not; but Calvin[2] says: "The Lord by his providence has consecrated to a perpetual remembrance those which he knew to be necessary to his church. And it is not by an accident that they are so few; but by an admirable design of God, the body of the Scripture has been composed such as we see it."

We see that even the really inspired words of apostles and prophets, those, even, of the Lord conversing with Moses on the mount or in the desert, and of the Son of God speaking to his dearest servants in the most momentous hours of his minis-

[1] ἔγραψα is often applied by the apostle to that which he has just been writing. See 1 Cor. ix. 13; Philem. 19, 21; 2 Cor. ii. 3; Gal. vi. 11; 1 John ii. 14.

[2] Comm. on Eph. iii. 3.

try (Luke xxiv. 27; Matt. xvii. 3), have not been preserved to us. But is it a loss for the church? We believe not, since God has not chosen to give them to her. We must believe that the number to be preserved would be limited, for otherwise "the world itself could not contain the books that should be written" (John xxi. 25), and the gospels were necessarily very brief. All the acorns which fall do not survive to produce oaks; but enough remain to fulfill the purposes of God. His holy Word is also a seed; he has scattered it by measure, and given us what we need.

Yet again, it must not be imagined, either, that all the words or writings of an Isaiah or a Daniel, of a Peter or a Paul, during a ministry of thirty years, or sixty years, or even, as Daniel's, of ninety years, were from morning to night under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. We believe this point was fully established in our Theopneusty. These prophets and apostles were inspired at certain definite times for specific purposes determined by God; but, at other times and for other objects, they were not so. In the dispute of Paul with Barnabas, God has not guaranteed to us all the apostle's words, nor all his parchments left with Carpus (2 Tim. iv. 13). That which is guaranteed is, the Holy Scripture, "all Scripture given by inspiration of God" (πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος). But beyond this, theopneusty spoken or written was, with these men of God, like their other *charisms* or "gifts," without doubt, an intermittent grace. They were generally, as the humble believer of to-day is, illuminated and preserved from on high; but they no more spoke as "led by the Holy Spirit," and their language, always worthy of the most respectful attention, at the same time was not infallible.

There is nothing of the books lost which God wished to give by his prophets; nothing of the canon of the Scriptures. Heaven and earth shall pass, but not a jot of the holy Word can pass away. (Matt. v. 18.)

BOOK SECOND.

CANONICITY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

We considered the question of the New Testament first, because much of the evidence in favor of the Old Testament canon is derived from it.

CHAPTER FIRST.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE JEWS.

There is in the history of Israel a fact not less wonderful than that of the preservation of their race for more than three thousand years in the midst of other nations like one family, unmixed and imperishable. That fact is the perfect and constant conservation of their canon for thirty-three and a half centuries.

We behold among this incomparable people from the days of Moses to the present time, notwithstanding all their wanderings and terrible sufferings, a constant unanimity in recognizing, without variation, the sacred collection of the Scriptures while it was being formed, and the whole volume since it was completed thirty-three hundred years ago. This canon, which our Bibles divide into thirty-nine books, but the Jews into twenty-two, in order to correspond with their twenty-two letters, as the Fathers did after them,[1] this volume, we say,

[1] Cyril of Jerusalem, Athanasius, John Damascenus, Jerome, Gregory Nazianzen, Epiphanius, etc. "Quomodo viginti duo elementa sunt per quæ scribimus Hebraïcè omne quod loquimur, ita viginti duo volumina supputantur." Jerome, Prolog. Galeatus (tom. i. p. 318. Bened. Paris, 1693).

finished four hundred years before Jesus Christ was born, has never ceased from that time to be read in all their synagogues throughout the earth as the "book of God." The nation of Israel, before their final dispersion, was already scattered into every known country. James, speaking of the Gentiles, says: "Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him." (Acts xv. 21.) Josephus says: "There is not a Grecian city and scarcely a barbarian city in which the rest of the Sabbath is not observed through the influence of the Jews." [1]

Now, that all the Israelites received the same canon of the Scriptures with the most perfect unanimity is a fact abundantly testified by the Jews of the apostles' time: Philo in Egypt, Josephus in Egypt and at Rome. And it is, moreover, another fact universally admitted, that, very long before the apostolical period, the Old Testament, both in Hebrew and in Greek, existed with its twenty-two books as we now possess them.

The testimony of Josephus is worthy of notice here, for this historian was only thirty years old at the death of Paul. He says to Apion: "Nothing can be better attested than the writings authorized among us. In fact, they could not be subject to any discord (*μήτε τινὸς ἐν τοῖς γραφομένοις ἐνούσης διαφωνίας*); for only that which the prophets wrote ages ago is approved among us, taught as they were by the very inspiration of God." "We then avoid having among us, as the Greeks have, a great number of books which are discordant and opposed to each other; *we have only twenty-two*, which contain all that has passed among us, and which may reasonably be believed. Five are of Moses." "The prophets after Moses wrote thirteen other books [2] describing what occurred after the death of Artaxerxes, . . . ; while the four other

[1] Against Apion, Lib. ii. chap. ix.

[2] Namely, 1, Joshua; 2, Judges (including Ruth); 3, Samuel; 4, Kings; 5, Chronicles; 6, Ezra (including Nehemiah); 7, Esther; 8, Job; 9, Isaiah; 10, Jeremiah and Lamentations; 11, Ezekiel; 12, Daniel; 13, the twelve minor prophets.

books[1] contain hymns for the praise of God and precepts to regulate our conduct." "They also wrote what has taken place, from Artaxerxes to our day; but because there was not the exact succession of prophets as before, these have not been received with the same faith as the former."

"Now, it appears from the facts how far we have believed in our own Scriptures; for, although already so many ages have passed, no one has ever dared either to *remove*, or *add*, or *transpose* any thing. And it is for all the Jews as a thought born with them from the first generation, to call them 'the teaching of God,' to abide in them, and, if necessary, to die with joy to maintain them."

We see clearly, therefore, by this testimony, that, to the days of Josephus, the entire Bible was composed of the same twenty-two books as for the modern Jews, or of our thirty-nine books; that, of whatever sect a Jew might be, however far he might go astray, he never betrayed the least dissent as to the sacred canon; that the books of the Bible, as well the most familiar as the most historical, Ruth, Esther, or Nehemiah, as well as the songs of David or the visions of Isaiah, were in their eyes equally written by the exact succession of the prophets, and under divine inspiration, and were equally called the decrees and doctrines of God; that, in fine, this common conviction was always so inherent in their existence as a Jewish people, that it could be said to be "born with them (*σύμφυτον*) from their first generation," and they were always ready to die for it.

And what Josephus said eighteen centuries ago, we may say now of the Jews, ever since the destruction of Jerusalem.

[1] Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Solomon's Song.

CHAPTER SECOND.

THE TESTIMONY OF JESUS CHRIST.

We here invoke the testimony of the "Amen, the faithful and true Witness." What did the Immanuel, "the God of the holy prophets" (Rev. xxii. 6), think of the Old Testament, and how did he treat it?

Never did he put its integrity or legitimacy in doubt; never did he manifest the least hesitation in regard to the divine authenticity of any of the twenty-two books of which it is composed; he has quoted from all or almost all of them with his own lips. Who then can discern the spirit of the prophets, if not he whose eternal Spirit quickened them all? (1 Pet. i. 11.) Who shall better tell us if such or such a book is from God or from man? "Chief shepherd of the sheep by the blood of the everlasting covenant," he has come to dwell among men; but who shall discern more correctly than he the voice of his own messengers from that of strangers and robbers? (John x. 5, 8.)

Now, we have heard him preaching these Scriptures himself; we have seen him take from the hand of the Jews in their synagogues the sacred scroll or volume as they extended it to him, opening it, and exclaiming before them all, "In the volume of the Book it is written of me!" We have heard him exclaim at their festival: "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life." (John v. 39.) We have, indeed, seen him go from one end to the other, explaining it: "beginning at Moses and all the prophets, expounding in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself." (Luke xxiv. 27, 44.) Did he ever reproach the Jews

for having altered the Scriptures? Never. He reproached them for constantly resisting the Scriptures, never for altering them. They were left to commit every crime but that. They rejected God, committed abominations with their infamous gods, and made their children pass through the fire; but never were they guilty of the crime so easily committed, of changing the Scriptures and introducing into them false books.

All the course of Christ as Son of man attests thus that no human teacher ever thought more respectfully of the sacred volume than he. Whichever of its twenty-two books he quotes, it is always for him God who speaks. This book is the rule of his life; it is to this entire book that he conforms his holy humanity, and would have us conform ours, to be saved. The least word of this book possesses in his view an authority more permanent than the heavens and the earth. When he seeks to convince the Sadducees and Pharisees, now he proves the resurrection to them by one single word from Exodus;[1] now the true doctrine of marriage, by a single word from Genesis;[2] now his own divinity, by a single word from the Psalm cx., or another from the eighty-second; and again, before uttering it, he interrupts himself to exclaim: "And the Scriptures can not be broken!"[3] When he begins his ministry he already knows the Scriptures without having studied them.[4] When he contends with Satan, he three times strikes him with "the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God." He says to Satan three times: "It is written." Finishing his ministry on the cross, he again repeats the twenty-second Psalm; and when he resumes it after the resurrection, for some days, he still is engaged in explaining the Scriptures,[5] "beginning at Moses and all the prophets and the Psalms." In a word, he quotes, as from God, Genesis,[6]

[1] Ex. iii. 6; Matt. xxii. 32.
[2] Matt. xix. 4; Gen. i. 27.
[3] Matt. xxii. 43; John x. 27, 35.
[4] John vii. 15.
[5] Luke xxiv. 27.
[6] Matt. xix. 4.

Exodus,[1] Leviticus,[2] Numbers,[3] Deuteronomy,[4] Samuel,[5] Kings,[6] Jonah,[7] Daniel,[8] Isaiah,[9] Hosea,[10] Jeremiah,[11] Psalms viii., xxii., xxxv., xxxi., xli., lxix., lxxxii., xci., cx., cxviii.,[12] and he quoted them, saying: Have you not read these words of David, speaking by the Holy Spirit? Have you not read what God spake by the mouth of David?

We see, then, how our Lord regarded the canon of the Old Testament. This was his science on this point, his sacred criticism: to receive all the Holy Scriptures of the Jews; to call them all in their detail, as in a body, *the Law;*[13] and to declare, "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail."[14]

[1] Matt. xxii. 32, 37. [2] Matt. v. 22, 43. [3] Matt. v. 33.
[4] Mark xii. 29; Luke x. 7, 27; John viii. 5, 7.
[5] Matt. xii. 3; Mark ii. 25; Luke vi. 24.
[6] Matt. xii. 42; Luke xi. 31. [7] Matt. xii. 40.
[8] Matt. xxiv. 15; Mark xiii. 14. [9] Matt. xiii. 14; xv. 7, 8; xxi. 5.
[10] Matt. ix. 13. [11] Matt. xxi. 13; Luke xix. 46.
[12] Matt. xxi. 16; John xix. 24; xv. 25; Luke xxiii. 46; John xiii. 18; John xv. 25; x. 34; Matt. iv. 6; Matt. xxii. 44; xxi. 42.
[13] John x. 34; xii. 34; Rom. ii. 14.
[14] Luke xvi. 17; Matt. v. 18.

CHAPTER THIRD.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE APOSTLES.

These men of God, charged with the announcement to the world of his eternal truth by the aid of the Holy Spirit, to bind and to loose, to discern spirits, and to become themselves apostles and prophets (Eph. ii. 20), "the twelve foundations of the universal church," these holy men have not ceased to regard the twenty-two books of the Old Testament as constituting a single whole, a complete unit, holy and perfect, which they call "the Scripture," "Word of God," the "oracles of God" (Acts vii. 38; Rom. iii. 2), and of which they say: "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God" (2 Tim. iii. 16; 1 Pet. i. 11; Acts iii. 21; Luke i. 70); all the prophets who wrote it had in them the Spirit of Christ; all the Old Testament is a written prophecy (προφητεία γραφῆς); "God himself has spoken by the mouth of his prophets since the world began."

CHAPTER FOURTH.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS FROM THE FOREGOING FACTS.

WHOEVER ranks himself as a disciple of Christ must receive his testimony on the canon, as on every other subject. But we go farther than this. Not only must we, as Christians, receive the Old Testament just as it was when our Lord approved of it, but we should also see with admiration the hand of God in the preservation of the ancient canon.

Whence came this marvelous concert of an entire race, otherwise so constantly in rebellion against God, this unanimous agreement of this people for three thousand years, in receiving and maintaining, with undeviating firmness, one only and the same canon of Scriptures? Certainly it comes from God alone. But, at the same time, under this action from above, there must also have been a common thought, an established principle among this people in regard to the canon, a principle furnishing security to all, small and great, learned and unlearned, to the great Sanhedrim solemnly reporting to its king the oracle of Micah,[1] and the humble synagogue, to the poor Jews of the dispersion in Macedonia, daily searching with care the Scriptures of their canon (*τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν ἀνακρίνοντες τὰς γραφάς*), to see if Paul's doctrine was conformed to their teaching;[2] to the pious Jewish mother, married to a Greek of Asia Minor, who early trained her little son[3] in the knowledge of the true God, teaching him daily from the Holy Book.

Now, what was this common source of assurance to all the

[1] Matt. ii. 6. [2] Acts xvii. 11. [3] *ἀπὸ βρέφους.* 2 Tim. iii. 15.

people of every grade of intelligence? It was not science, but faith in a doctrine, faith in God, faith in the Word itself.

No one can doubt that the faith of the Jewish race in their religion was as rational as the faith men now have in modern science. But it was not founded in a knowledge of the history of the canon, such as we have concerning our New Testament canon. The canon of the Old Testament had no history. The Hebrews, in the time of Christ, possessing no literary monuments besides the Scriptures itself, could not demonstrate the authenticity of their sacred books by documents outside of the book itself, as we can that of the New Testament. Their holy books came from too remote an antiquity to present a cotemporary literature, or even a literature of ages subsequent, of any real weight. The writings of the old Greeks quoted by Josephus were too recent to have any importance as testimony; while those of the Egyptians, Assyrians, and Persians had no religious relations with the sacred literature of the Hebrews. They had, then, as a test of the Old Testament, only the Old Testament itself. Now, who could say, in the days of Josephus and of the apostles, any more than we can, by what human means Moses provided for the preservation of his books after they were placed in the holy ark (Deut. xxxi. 26)? By the priests? Josephus seems to think it was;[1] but who can affirm it? What prophet wrote the closing scenes of the Pentateuch, describing the death of Moses, his burial, the long mourning that followed it, and making this declaration: "And there arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses?"[2] Joshua, do you say? That might be; but who knows? Who wrote Job? In a word, no one knows which of the prophets put the last hand to the twenty-two books of the Old Testament to give them to the church for all future time. There are many conjectures; but who knows?

And if you do not know the authors of all these Scrip-

[1] Against Apion, Lib. i. chap. 2.

[2] Deut. xxxiv. 10.

tures, it is entirely sufficient to be able to say, with Jesus Christ, that they were prophets.

All the elements of science for the canon of the Old Testament, then, are wanting. Yet the faith of the Jewish church was more solidly founded than on the basis of science. It was founded on the declarations of God, his character and his acts. They knew that he had given them these Scriptures, and had preserved them, because he is faithful. And if you had lived in the days of Jesus Christ, a faithful Israelite, you would have believed with all the Jews, and with Christ, in the canon of the Scriptures. And if you had doubted the canon, Jesus would have said to you as to the Sadducees: "Do ye not therefore err, because ye know not the Scriptures of God?" (Mark xii. 24.)

Our faith in the Old Testament, as we have seen, is founded on the testimony of him who is above Moses and all the prophets, and on the testimony of his inspired apostles, in addition to all that sustained the faith of the ancient Jews in these sacred oracles. Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ, explains to us the mystery of the preservation of that canon. He tells that God gave it in trust to the Jews (ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ). And the whole of their miraculous history is but a suitable accompaniment of so sacred a charge, and was an indispensable means of securing to the world the preservation of these sacred documents.

We have now one other great division of our subject to consider, — the answer to the inquiry, Have we admitted all the inspired books to the canon of the Old Testament? In other words, Are the apocryphal books a part of the Old Testament?

CHAPTER FIFTH.

THE APOCRYPHAL BOOKS.

History of the Apocrypha before the Council of Trent.

The universal church of the second, third, and fourth centuries had never ceased to receive the Old Testament as the Jews had it, always distinguishing very scrupulously the apocryphal from the canonical books, when God raised up in the Latin church a great luminary in the person of Jerome. This illustrious teacher, born A. D. 331, was to be for eleven centuries, down to the council of Trent, their teacher and guide in the study of the Scriptures. He had, in fact, more than any one else, led them to the pure sources of the biblical Word, and had first translated for them the Old Testament from the original Hebrew;[1] giving them thus that famous version called the Vulgate, afterwards pronounced by them canonical in every part. Jerome enjoyed such credit in the church of Rome, that, in its Breviary, it thanks God "for having raised up in his church this blessed and very illustrious teacher to explain the Scriptures," and to this day they repeat in every one of their churches throughout the world, every 30th of September, that they thank God for the blessed Jerome raised up to expound the Scriptures.[2]

And it was also in the same spirit, that, even to the time of the council of Trent, the church of Rome, yet in the sixteenth century, had not ceased to give Jerome's prefaces to

[1] All their previous versions had been translations of the Greek Septuagint.

[2] Breviar. Rom. Sept. xxx. p. 822, ed. Paris, 1840.

every edition of the Bible it published; and that even, a very short time after the council, these prefaces all declared that all Christians ought carefully to distinguish between the canonical and the apocryphal books. We may mention, for instance, that of Birckman at Antwerp in 1526, and others.

But what do we behold in the council of Trent? Every thing is so changed, as to Jerome, in the church of Rome, that if this Father could declare in the fourth century that he rejected the Story of Susanna, and the Song of the Three Hebrew Children, and that he regarded the History of Bel and the Dragon as a fable;[1] and if, nevertheless, as the Breviary says, he was, for eleven centuries, not only "one of the greatest teachers" (doctor maximus), but even one of the saints in paradise to whom prayer should be addressed, — yet the anathema was pronounced, on the 15th of April, 1546, in that council, against every one who should speak of the eleven apocryphal books as he had spoken.

And how do they get over this embarrassing fact? See how. The famous bishop Catharinus says, "This Father was not giving his own view, so much as that of the Jews." Whoever reads Jerome can see the weakness of this defense.[2] The Jesuit Gretser says, "He varies his statements about the number of the books, and is not consistent." He *is* very consistent. And thus we may quote at length their evasions.

Of the sixteen scriptures which Jerome rejected as apocryphal, and which we also reject, Rome admits eleven as divine.

They are first these seven: Tobias, Judith, 1 and 2 Maccabees, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and Baruch; then three Greek fragments, added to the canonical Hebrew text of Daniel, Song of the Three Hebrew Young Men, History of

[1] Præfat in Danielem.

[2] Herbst, the Catholic writer (Einleit. ins A. T.), abandons the attempt to reconcile the views of Jerome with the Roman unity of faith, and limits himself to representing them as the opinions of an individual.

Susanna, History of Bel; then, finally, seven Greek chapters added to Esther.

After the catalogue of the holy books increased by these eleven apocryphal books, the council adds this curse: "And if any one shall not receive as sacred and canonical these entire books with all their parts, as they are found in the ancient Latin Vulgate, let him be anathema."

When the forty-five bishops and five cardinals, all, or nearly all, Italians, and pensioned by the pope, assembled at Trent, on the 8th of April, 1546, dared to enact such a decree, which, for the first time, put the apocryphal books in the rank of the Scriptures of God, they not only gave the lie to the only true depositaries of his divine oracles, "they imagined at their pleasure," says bishop Cosin, in his beautiful work on the canon,[1] "a new article of faith, of which the other portions of Christendom, and even their own church, had never even heard; and they caused in the universal church a schism more profound than the malice of men had ever produced."

They went so far as to cut off from heaven all who, with Jesus Christ and his apostles, with the ancient Fathers, with even the author of their own version of the Bible, the Vulgate, with all the present Oriental church, older than theirs, refused to attribute to the apocryphal books equal authority with the Scriptures of Moses and the prophets. So that their canon is no longer that of the church of Israel, nor that of Jesus Christ, nor that of the universal primitive church, nor that of the Oriental church, nor that even of the ancient Latin church for fifteen hundred years. It is the canon of the Jesuits, or the new canon of the council of Trent.

And it was thus that God, by a terrible judgment abandoning to their own counsels men whose pretensions had become

[1] Scholastical History of the Canon. 4to. London, 1672 and 1683. See his articles 165 to 175, 177 to 179. Most of the following testimonies are taken from this work. See also History of the Council of Trent, by Fra Paolo Sarpi, Lib. ii. art. 37, 47, 48, 56. Lond. edit. 1736, p. 220–241; or p. 143 of edit. of 1676.

so extravagant as to call themselves the sole interpreters of his eternal Word, permitted that they alone, of all the Christian sects, should by a solemn decree intrude eleven human books into the sacred oracles. And that nineteen hundred years after the epoch when every prophet of the Old Testament church had disappeared from the midst of Israel!

But still farther: This act appears, if possible, yet more strange, when we consider the profane levity with which the decree was consummated. It was a surprise, a *coup d'état* in the church of Rome; much resembling that which in our days determined the new doctrine about Mary. Perhaps it should be said that the dogma of 1546 was decided in the council of Trent with even a greater contempt of the church and its rights than is charged against Pius IX., throwing from the Vatican, on what he calls "the universal church," his doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. We do not here speak of the intrigues which for a long time misled the council, and which finally moulded and mastered it. We speak only of the nature of those sessions from which the decree emanated.[1]

Reasons against the Decree of Trent.

Not only had the council no sufficient reasons for this decision, but the most powerful considerations existed to deter them from it. We can but name them, without enlarging.

1. Whereas all the books of the Old Testament are written in Hebrew,[2] the apocryphal books are in Greek.

[1] The author here gives a fair and impressive view of the character of the council, which is to be found abundantly stated elsewhere. We therefore omit it here. — *Tr.*

[2] Or, at least, in Aramean. Jerome says he translated Tobias and Judith from the Chaldee, and had seen 1 Macc. in Hebrew. The preface of Ecclesiasticus also gives this book as translated from the Hebrew. (See Einleitung of the Cathol. profes. Welte Freid, 1844.) Yet Hengstenburg (Beiträge, i. 292) believes that the Greek text is the original. Jahn (Introd. ii. 902, 922) expresses the same opinion as to Tobias and Judith.

2. In the drama of Susanna there are plays upon words which depend entirely for their point on their being Greek (verses 55, 58).

3. These books were all written after the spirit of prophecy had ceased in Israel.

4. Many scholars, as Moldenhauer, have given very strong reasons for maintaining that Tobias, and the 4th of Esdras, if not Wisdom, are posterior to the Christian era.[1]

5. None of their authors pretend directly to be inspired, except that of the book of Wisdom, which, in ascribing itself to Solomon, betrays its fraud by quoting from Isaiah and Jeremiah, and by representing its cotemporaries as already subdued by their enemies (ix. 7, 8; xv. 14; compare 1 Kings iv. 20–25).

6. So far from pretending to be inspired, many of them declare they are not. See the prologue of Ecclesiasticus; 1 Maccabees iv. 46; ix. 27; 2 Macc. ii. 23; xv. 38.

7. No portion of the apocrypha is quoted by Christ or his apostles.

8. Neither Philo nor Josephus quotes them; while, on the contrary, the testimony of Josephus, quoted by Eusebius and by us, is very decided in fixing the books that are inspired, and asserting the merely human character of the other Jewish books.

9. The apocrypha contains many fables, contrary to historical truth, and to the Holy Scriptures. See Bel and the Dragon, the histories of Tobias, etc.; . . . compare 2 Macc. i. 18, with Esdras iii. 2, 3, and 2 Macc. ii. 5, 8, with Jerem. iii. 16.

10. The First and Second Maccabees contradict each other. Antiochus Epiphanes dies in Babylon (1 Macc. vi. 16); he is decapitated in Persia in the temple of Nanna (2 Macc. i. 14, 16); then he dies in a strange land in the mountains (ix. 28). The second book is evidently very inferior to the other.

11. These same books frequently recommend immoral

[1] Horne, Introd. ii. 326.

practices. This can be seen abundantly in Des Marets's preface to the French Bible.

Unanimous Testimony of the Churches against the Decree of the Council.

Bishop Cosin[1] remarks: "After having made a thorough examination of all the views of the church in every age and country in regard to the canon of the Old Testament, I conclude that the voice of every age and of every portion of the people of God has been raised against the decree of the Tridentine council."

[The author passes in review, in Palestine and Syria, Justin Martyr, Eusebius, Jerome, and John Dasmascenus, thence through Asia Minor, Egypt, Africa, Greece, Italy, Spain, France, Germany, Holland, and England, declaring that all these witnesses, of whom a large number are among the saints canonized by Rome, however far they have followed in other points the errors of their times, are unanimous in distinguishing the apocrypha from the oracles of God, or in wholly repudiating them.]

Even Francis Ximenes, cardinal, archbishop of Toledo, grand inquisitor, the famous John Pic, Erasmus, and even Cajetau, all of the very century of the council of Trent, high in the estimation of the Roman church, held our views of the apocrypha.

It is, then, well established that when the church of Rome, on the 13th of April, 1546, in its universal council of fifty persons, under the influence of Catharinus and his faction, eagerly framed a new additional canon of the Holy Scriptures, uniting with it the body of traditions, as no less infallible than "the oracles of the living God," she committed this double fault in opposition to the testimony of the universal church in every age, and did it, by her own avowal, in order

[1] Hist. Schol. of the Canon. See also Gerhard, De Scripturâ Sacrâ, § 75–98; and Keerl, Die apocrypha des A. T. (Leips. 1852), § 18.

to establish the dogmas which the famous bull of Pius IV. was going to add to the ancient confession of faith, in regard to the supremacy of the church of Rome, transubstantiation, withholding the cup, invocation of the saints, relics, images, and indulgences. The council says: "Let all, then, fully understand in what order and by what method this synod will proceed after having thus LAID THE FOUNDATION of the confession of faith, as also *what testimonies* and what defences it is going particularly to employ in proving the doctrines and reforming the practices of the church."

How remarkable, then, is the contrast! It would have been our anticipation, had we known that both the Jewish and the Christian churches were to apostatize or greatly decline from the spirit of piety, that each would have corrupted its own branch of the Scriptures. But just the reverse of this has taken place! And let us see under what circumstances.

The Israelites sunk down into great ignorance and indifference to their religious interests during their subjection to foreign powers, and especially their exile and the utter breaking up of their social and ecclesiastical state. And yet this people who had so rebelled against God, who could crucify the Lord of glory, and who, for eighteen hundred years, could reject his New Testament, have never been willing to introduce a single apocryphal book into the Old Testament, although it may treat of their national history and flatter their national pride.

But in the sixteenth century, a large and powerful section of the Christian church has taken the book intrusted to the Jewish church by the hand of God, sanctioned by the testimony of the Son of God, and the holy apostles, and dared to introduce into it eleven books written by uninspired men!

We must here closely contemplate this double fact and double contrast. Whilst the church of the pope has dared thus to treat the Old Testament, yet never has this sect, powerful as it is, nor any other Christian sect, been able *to add a single apocryphal book to the New Testament.* God has

never permitted them to do it. "Thus far shalt thou come, but no further; and here shall thy proud waves be stayed." God himself is the guardian of his holy Word.

Contemplate, then, disciple of Jesus Christ, these two depositaries of thy sacred books, and see with what power this twofold testimony of their contrasts and their resemblances is here presented, — equally rebellious, equally indocile as to the trust not committed to them, but equally docile and faithful in regard to the trust committed to each respectively, faithful, the one for twenty-three hundred years, since the completion of the Old Testament, the other for fourteen hundred years, since the entire canon of the New Testament has been definitely received in all the churches of Christendom.

Let the case, then, be fully understood; neither ignorance, error, nor profane temerity in any one branch of the Christian church in regard to the Old Testament can in any way affect the inviolability of a canon which never was committed to them. If I had deposited my last will and testament under the most legal forms with a notary duly selected, could my heirs after me put in question the integrity or validity of the act, because, after long years, one of them had chosen to insert notable additions to the authentic copy in the notary's hands, and because he claimed that he was bound to regard neither the primitive text, its consistency, its depositary, nor the laws? Would this action affect the other heirs? What do they care for it? This insane and wicked fantasy would in no degree change the paternal testament.

In like manner the attempt made at Trent in 1546, so far from diminishing the marvelous fact of the inviolability of the Old Testament, has served only to show it more prominently. For, we have said, the very unfaithfulness of Christians and that of the Jews, in regard to the trust not committed to them, only sets forth the more strikingly their fidelity in regard to the other books, and reveals to us the hand of God the more clearly.

CHAPTER SIXTH.

CONCLUSION.

We have, then, shown that the canon of the Old and New Testaments as we now have them constitutes the Word of God, the revelation from heaven, the supreme rule of faith and practice.

It has also appeared manifest that the very preservation of them can be explained, not by natural causes, but alone by the secret and continual intervention of the divine power.

This preservation we have shown to be truly a miracle; divine power working against the natural tendencies of the human heart; a fact as miraculous as the preservation of the Jewish race itself for so many centuries, having no country, no national or even ecclesiastical bonds of union. We regard, then, the inviolability of the canon, like inspiration, to be a doctrine of our faith.

What striking facts, what powerful proofs have now passed before our eyes, all strongly demonstrating this silent and sovereign employment of the churches by God for the sure maintaining of his two Testaments!

And surely, if the gates of hell cannot prevail against the church, they cannot prevail against that Word on which the church is founded. What, in fact, should we be, and what would the church be, if God had not guaranteed his sacred volume against all alteration.

Moreover, all the more modern history of the canon agrees exactly with the first ways of God in regard to his written Word; it is a harmonious and uninterrupted continuation of the miracle of thirty-three centuries in the preservation of

the Old Testament. Has he who intrusted the ancient oracles to one people for a hundred generations, for eighteen centuries committed the new oracles, much more important, and given for the whole human race, to the care of no one? By no means. And we may say that the miracle of the churches, guardians of the new canon, is so completely a continuation of the miracle of the Jewish guardianship of the Old Testament, that the prodigy even presents a growing progression of harmony and beauty. In seeing it accomplished by the constant fidelity of the Jews, a fidelity which began before the Trojan war, and which has not ceased to this day, we might well conclude that, if it pleased God to give long afterward another series of sacred oracles to the Gentiles, he would choose from the midst of them other depositaries evidently charged with preserving this treasure even to the great day of Jesus Christ. And how much should our faith be strengthened by the fact that this second prodigy is accomplished with even more magnificence than the first!

Press the Bible, then, to your hearts, Christians of every rank and every age, your whole Bible. You have it from God.

Receive all it contains with the same affection, the same submission; the twenty-seven books which the Christian church gives you, as the twenty-two which you get from the Jews.[1] You hold the former from the Christian churches, you hold the latter from the Jews; but you get them from God, by their inspiration, and by their preservation. Say this often to yourself; there is a blessing in it. They can not be read with profit unless they are read with reverence; they can not be read with reverence, if they are not read with a full conviction of their authenticity and their inspiration. It is by this Word, thus heard as descended from above, that you will obtain from God repentance, peace, adoption, joy, holiness, life eternal.

But to that end, Christian brethren, you must know your

[1] Divided, we repeat, by us into thirty nine books.

privilege; you must not only make a bold profession of it, but also avail yourselves of it with God and before all men; you must, supported on the doctrine of the canon, employ your sacred books with the same confidence that Christ and his apostles exercised toward the Old Testament; you must say with Christ, "It is written."

The same canon is clearly demonstrated to you; the seals of the living God are attached to it. Never forget it.

It is, unquestionably, within the heart that God attests the Scriptures for his elect with the incomparable seals of his Spirit; but you have seen, likewise, very clearly that God even seals them externally with his own seal, by means of the marvelous testimony of all the generations of the Jewish people and of all the generations of Christians in the earth.

Remember, therefore, Christian brethren, the miracle of the Scriptures, and of their divine preservation; hold your eyes open to these signs of God, and ever keep yourselves from that guilty want of understanding and that fatal inattention with which Jesus reproached his disciples when they had forgotten the miracle of the bread: "Do ye not yet understand, neither remember? Have ye the heart yet hardened? Having eyes, see ye not?"

And why did they forget this miracle of the loaves? Alas! for the same reason that makes us too often forget the miracle of the Scriptures, and which should, on the contrary, render it more striking. Because the sign, really so full of grandeur, was, like that of the Scriptures now for thirty-four centuries, noiseless, without display, and calm, by natural means, the people being seated on the grass, and the apostles carrying the baskets from group to group. But surely it was not accidental that those five barley-loaves and those two fishes nourished five thousand men! And surely, too, it is not an accident that the sacred volume has been kept for thirty-four centuries, and that all the depositaries have universally and constantly been rendering the same testimony

in order to enlighten, with the same light, all the elect of God! Certainly the same cause accounts for both!

Christians, forget not the miracle of the bread! Never forget that of the Scriptures!

Ministers of our churches, pastors of our learned congregations, and you humble evangelists, you, too, missionaries in Africa and Asia, go boldly to the most learned as to the most humble of your hearers; go with this book of God, fearing not that they will ask you for the history of its canon, and without being troubled that the Old Testament has none. You know as much of it as Daniel, the prophet, as much as Paul, the apostle of the Gentiles. You know even more, since you possess the experience of many centuries, during which God has not ceased to keep his oracles entirely pure by the hands of the Jews. Go, then, boldly, as the prophet went to the synagogues of Babylon, or the apostle to those of Lycaonia; for you have the same evidence to show to establish the inviolableness of the sacred volume; and all that they could say, you can still say. "Behold the oracles of God committed to his people, — oracles so preserved as that one fragment of a letter has never perished; the Jews never swerved from their fidelity; they never betrayed this sacred trust; not a book has ever perished from the sacred volume; their testimony never varies, notwithstanding their misfortunes and their crimes; never have they been reproached for altering the Scriptures."

"Now to him that is of power to establish you according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began, but now is made manifest, and by the Scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith: to God only wise, be glory through Jesus Christ for ever. Amen."

THE END.

IRA J. TAYLOR LIBRARY
THE ILIFF SCHOOL OF THEOLO
DENVER, COLORADO

939010

BINDING CO.
SEVENTEENTH ST
NVER, CO 80211